2.19.07.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Rev. Wm. B. Scarborough

Division BS525

Section .D25

V. 1.

Copy 1

Wm. B. Scarborough

A TREATISE

ON

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

VOLUME I.

Id praecipue officio meo contineri existimavi, ut adulescentes probos et candidos, in quorum studiis fortuna ac spes ecclesiae et litterarum posita est, ea docerem quae multo labore et anxia sedulitate quaesita viderer mihi quam verissima repperisse; non ut illi me tamquam ducem sectarentur aut in his quae tradidissem adquiescerent, sed singula ut ipsi investigarent, investigata perpenderent, perpensa probarent corrigerent augerent.—LACHMANN.

A

TREATISE

ON

BIBLICAL CRITICISM

EXHIBITING

A SYSTEMATIC VIEW OF THAT SCIENCE.

BY SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE, AND LL.D.

VOLUME I.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BOSTON:

GOULD AND LINCOLN, 59 WASHINGTON STREET.

MDCCCLIII.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D.

BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

My Lord,

I take the liberty of dedicating these volumes to you as a mark of my veneration for your character and respect for your varied attainments. A Christian bishop, you occupy a distinguished place among your right reverend and learned brethren, adorning the high station to which Providence has called you by a rare and sanctified scholarship fitted to excite the admiration of all who come within the sphere of your influence. In you the Episcopal Church is favoured with one who raises it to a proud pre-eminence in the eye of the literature of Europe. Though we be widely separated in ecclesiastical position, I do not entertain the less esteem for you; or think the less highly on that account of your intellectual ability and moral worth. Accept then the offering of one who desires to cherish

the spirit of an enlarged liberality capable of rising above the outward distinctions of sect to offer its cordial homage to the learning and talents which dignify renewed humanity. A work whose object is to promote divine truth cannot be more appropriately dedicated than to you. I am fully aware that none is more likely than yourself to detect its imperfections; but I know your candour in judging the performances of others who cannot hope to reach the height of learning to which you have attained; and believe that you will indulgently give me credit for an honest attempt to contribute to the purity of the records of Revelation.

That you may be long preserved to the Christian church, and to a country justly proud of your attainments, is the sincere prayer of your lordship's humble servant,

SAMUEL DAVIDSON.

PREFACE.

THIRTEEN years ago the writer published a volume entitled "Lectures on Biblical Criticism," which met with considerable favour, and has been for some time out of print. Many inquiries having been addressed to the author respecting it, he resolved to prepare a new edition as soon as his other avocations allowed leisure for the task. He had not been insensible to its various errors and imperfections. Many of these he had himself perceived; several were pointed out by others. Biblical literature had been advanced by more extensive researches and new discussions. But when he set himself in serious earnest to the work, he soon found that a new edition merely could neither do justice to the subject nor to his own reputation. A *new book* was needed. Every thing had to be re-written, and put into a new shape. The whole had to be recast both in sub-

stance and form. A *new work* accordingly has been attempted; the author availing himself of all the helps and sources which might serve to make it what it ought to be at the present day; and *a new title in part* has been given to it, corresponding to the enlarged field of inquiry.

In the course of reconstructing the materials, they swelled out in size under the author's hands, to require two volumes—the first confined to the Old Testament, the second to the New. It is hoped that the work will be found greatly superior to "the Lectures" in every respect. It has cost him much more labour, research, and thought than the former. In every instance he has endeavoured to go back to the sources for himself; for which purpose private and public libraries have been consulted. The latest works of whose existence he was aware have been used. All available dissertations, wherever they appeared, have been attended to. Of course German works are most to the author's purpose, since they are more numerous and excellent in this department than English, French, or Dutch.

Many of the subjects which come under discussion in the department termed Biblical Criticism are necessarily difficult. The evidence on which conclusions are formed is of a kind that rejects certainty. Different opinions may be entertained

respecting the results to which testimony leads. Hence it will not surprise any, except the very ignorant, to be told, that various opinions formerly held by the author have been abandoned. *Repeated inquiries and reflection* have led him to change, modify, and retract former views. He is free to confess that he has never arrived at certainty on all subjects. But the reader has here the *latest* and *most mature* judgments of the author, for which alone he begs to be held accountable.

In its present form the work will probably be considered less elementary than its prototype. If this be so, let it be remembered that it is *more extended*, and, as the author thinks, more satisfactory and complete in every part. He has also tried to make his meaning so plain that none may have difficulty in apprehending it.

Some passages whose proper reading ought to have been discussed in the second volume are omitted, because an examination of them is given in another work. Mark xvi. 9-20; John v. 3, 4, and vii. 53—viii. 11, are examined in the first volume of the writer's Introduction to the New Testament, and it seemed superfluous to repeat what is there.

The author has to express his obligations to Dr. S. P. Tregelles for various hints, suggestions, and cautions, by means of which his book has been im-

proved. The ready advice of this most learned and Christian friend has never been wanting. It has been freely and generously given. He has also to thank the Rev. Wm. Cureton, F.R.S., and Canon of Westminster, for permission to see and make use of his unpublished Syriac gospels. Valuable assistance on some points has also been rendered by Dr. M. Steinschneider, the learned author of the *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* and other works connected with the literature of the Jews. Nor can he forget to record the uniform kindness and counsel of his old and valued friend Dr. H. Hupfeld of Halle, whose opinion he was favoured with on several difficult particulars. To the Rev. Dr. Lee, formerly Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, and justly celebrated for his knowledge of Oriental languages, he is indebted for information on various points connected with the old Syriac version, and especially that edition of it which he edited—information communicated with prompt generosity.

It is hoped that the general index will prove a valuable help to the consultation of the work. It has been prepared with great care by the Rev. J. Jennings.

In concluding his laborious task, the writer may be allowed to indulge the feeling that he has done something to establish the text of Scripture in

its integrity and incorruptness. His object has been to uphold and preserve the sacred records; to shew that they have a rightful claim to the place they have so long occupied. He does not wish to defend any thing incapable of standing the test of an intelligent scrutiny, or to apologise for that which reason rejects as contrary to its dictates. He has had no party prejudices to pander to; no denominational or ecclesiastical preferences to foster. He has acted freely and independently in his inquiries, believing that the documents of revelation *should* and *will be* sifted in the present age of mental activity. If his labours shall in any wise assist the student of Scripture, he will have reason to believe that his time has not been misspent over this and other biblical works. Devoutly thanking that God who has given him health and strength to work in His vineyard, and has enabled him to complete the present volumes, he sends them forth with the sincere prayer, that they may help the cause of truth in the world, promote the progress of righteousness, and contribute to a better acquaintance with those divine writings which form the basis alike of social order and of personal happiness.

LANCASHIRE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE,
Manchester, November 1st, 1852.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER I.

Page

Introductory 1

CHAPTER II.

The Hebrew Language 6

CHAPTER III.

The Hebrew Characters 20

CHAPTER IV.

The Hebrew Vowels 37

CHAPTER V.

History of the Text of the Old Testament 53

CHAPTER VI.

History of the Text itself 61

CHAPTER VII.

History of the Text from the Close of the Canon till the Destruction of Jerusalem 109

CHAPTER VIII.

Page

History of the Text from the downfall of the Jewish State till the final establishment of the Masoretic Text 112

CHAPTER IX.

From the final settlement of the Masoretic Text and the Departure of the Learned Jews from the East, till part of the Bible first appeared in Print ; or from A.D. 1040 till A.D. 1477 135

CHAPTER X.

History of the Printed Text 137

CHAPTER XI.

Ancient Versions—The Septuagint 162

CHAPTER XII.

Septuagint (continued) 200

CHAPTER XIII.

Greek Versions of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, &c. 215

CHAPTER XIV.

Targums 224

CHAPTER XV.

Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch 240

CHAPTER XVI.

Peshito or old Syriac Version 243

CHAPTER XVII.

Arabic Versions 255

CHAPTER XVIII.

Page
Latin Versions 261

CHAPTER XIX.

Remarks on Ancient Versions and their Application to Criticism 284

CHAPTER XX.

Parallels or Repeated Passages 294

CHAPTER XXI.

Quotations from the Old Testament in the New 308

CHAPTER XXII.

Quotations from Rabbinical Writings 314

CHAPTER XXIII.

Hebrew MSS. 321

CHAPTER XXIV.

Hebrew MSS. described 346

CHAPTER XXV.

Hebrew MSS. in China and other Oriental parts 366

CHAPTER XXVI.

Critical Conjecture 374

CHAPTER XXVII.

Application of the various Sources of Criticism 381

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Examination of various Passages 388

Oldest Modes of Writing Among the Phenicians & Hebrews.			Old Syrian Modes of Writing on Stones.		Modern Hebrew Writing in Old M.S.S.		
Phenician on Stones and Coins.	*Old Hebrew on the Maccabean Coins.*	*Samaritan in MSS ap Blanchini II. 604.*	*On the Carpentras Stone.*	*On the Palmyrene Ruins.*	*ap Blanchini II 604* Cod. Vat 2 a 973	*ap Blanchini II 604* Cod. Ben. Est a 1187.	*ap Dobrovsky Cod. Prag*
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
20.							
30.							
40.							
50.							
60.							
70.							
80.							
90.							
100.							
200.							
300.							
400.							

ERRATA, CORRECTIONS, AND ADDITIONS.

The reader is particularly requested to correct the following *errata*, as well as to peruse the *additional* explanations and remarks :—

VOL. I.

Page 20, line 5, for "oldest Hebrew MSS known," read, "oldest Hebrew MSS."

Page 21, line 12, for "Origin," read "Origen."

Page 23, third line from bottom, for "words," read "works."

Page 40, line 25, for "*lectiones*," read "*lectionis*."

Page 60, line 3, &c. The statement here made is scarcely definite enough to prevent misconception. It is true that *the system* of Pagninus was adopted by Robert Stephens ; but there is no connexion between *the verses* of Pagninus and those of Stephens. Stephens proceeded on a plan somewhat similar ; but the verses he made were very different from those of Pagninus.

Page 107, last line but one from bottom, for "300 years" read "200 years."

Page 138, fourth line from bottom. According to Steinschneider, the volume appeared in 1485.

Page 139, line 15. According to Steinschneider, the volume appeared in 1486.

Page 180, line 12, for "three," read "two."

Page 214, line 3, for "Ephraeimi," read "Ephraemi."

Page 271, line 22, for "Baronius speaks of a copy in the handwriting of Alcuin himself being in the library at Vauxcelles ; but Porson justly suspected the MS. as *the original* of Alcuin. A similar MS. (the same ?) sometimes called *Charlemagne's Bible*, is now in the British Museum, which, as is alleged, was," read "Baronius speaks of a copy being in the library at Vallicella, *i.e.* in the library of the church of the oratory of St. Philip Neri at Rome, where the MS. is still kept. Blanchini gives a fac-simile of it. It is also spoken of by Birch on 1 John v. 7. This is not the same with Alcuin's or Charlemagne's Bible in the British Museum, the latter being that described by Hug as belonging to M. Speyer of Basel (vol. i. p. 417). Of this one it is alleged, that it was,"

Page 429, line 13, for "Greek," read "king."

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

The science of Biblical Criticism is of comparatively recent origin. Formerly, its importance and comprehensive character were not perceived. It attracted more attention in later times. At present it is cultivated so extensively that it may be said to owe all its advancement to the preceding and present centuries. It arose, in part, out of necessity. In consequence of the controversies in which they were involved, men were obliged to appeal to the sacred fountain of truth itself. The Scriptures themselves were consulted as the highest authority in matters of doctrine and discipline.

But the records of religion were not in the purest state, and needed restoration. And in rightly repairing to the fountain-head of divine truth, men were too prone to alter or omit whatever they did not relish. They evinced an inclination to retain or mutilate a passage, as it seemed to corroborate their own opinions, or to favour their own sect. Such conduct, indeed, belongs to no age of Christianity exclusively. It was not unknown in the earlier period of the gospel dispensation; it has not been strange to modern times.

In every ancient book which has descended to our times through a number of centuries, various readings exist. It is utterly impossible for human caution and diligence to guard

against the slightest departure from an author's original words. Hence it becomes necessary to judge between different readings, to weigh the evidence by which they are respectively supported, and the claims they present to a favourable reception. The authentic reading must be determined by authorities; and these authorities are judged of by certain rules. This is true of the classical works of Greece and Rome. Manuscripts of them have been examined and compared by scholars whose object was to obtain as pure a text as existing materials afforded. Various editions have been published. The same is the case with the Bible. Providence has left its *words* to the same casualties as the writings of uninspired men; while the great doctrines and duties revealed have been preserved. God has not interposed by miracle to prevent the occurrence of minor variations in the transcription of copies. He has exercised no more than *a general superintendence* over the written expression of his will.

If then it be a laudable thing to restore the unvitiated text of a heathen author, such conduct should be considered far more laudable in regard to the Bible. The great Author from whom it proceeds, the consequent importance of its contents, and the design of its bestowment on man, conspire to place it immensely above the emanations of the highest unaided intellects. The first duty, therefore, is to direct attention to the true and proper reading of the original. The words first written ought to be sought out and discovered. We must judge, in the first place, whether an alteration has been made in a passage. The correctness or incorrectness of the text must be considered. If it have undergone change, the nature of the change should be examined, and the reading or readings restored into whose place others have intruded. *After this*, we may proceed with confidence to interpret the text. *Criticism* is followed by *interpretation.*

The expression *Biblical Criticism* is employed in two

senses. In the one, it embraces not only *the restoration of the text* to its original state, but *the principles of interpretation* also. According to the other, it is confined to the former alone. We shall employ it in its strict and proper sense, as comprehending the sum and substance of that knowledge which enables us to discover a wrong reading, to remove it from the text, and to obtain as nearly as possible the original words of the Bible.

It is quite obvious that the operation of criticism must precede that of interpretation. The former is introductory to the latter. It serves as the basis of it. Before trying to ascertain the meaning of an author's words, we should be careful to see that *we have* his words. The true reading must be known previously to the determination of the true sense; and the nearer one comes to the very words of an author, the nearer will he be to a correct interpretation of them.

It is necessary to attend to the distinct operations of these two departments—viz., *the criticism* and the *interpretation* of the Bible, since they have been frequently commingled, to the detriment of both. It is true, that the one is of little practical utility without the other. But that is no reason why they should be confounded. None can properly object to their *connection*, though he may to their *amalgamation*. It is proper that the one should be immediately followed by the other; but it is wrong to mix them. Wherever this is done, one need scarcely expect clear and sound exposition, or look for that careful interpretation which commends itself at once by its natural simplicity.

Our present business is not the *interpretation* of the Bible. Neither the general principles of it, nor the application of them to particular passages, come before us. Sacred criticism must be described and known first. The higher province of interpretation follows.

When the science of sacred criticism in its widest extent is calmly considered, its importance rises in the estimation of all

competent judges. Yet it has not been cultivated in Great Britain with the zeal and ardour it has awakened and sustained on the continent of Europe in modern times. The learning involved in its prosecution has not commonly appeared in this country. But tokens of better things are beginning to appear.

There are five sources from which criticism derives all its aid in ascertaining the changes that have been made in the original text of the Bible, and replacing authentic readings excluded by them.

I. Ancient versions of the Sacred Scriptures.

II. Parallels or repeated passages.

III. Quotations.

IV. MSS. or written copies.

V. Critical conjecture.

The materials thus furnished are generally ample and satisfactory. Criticism employs them all in procuring a text as near as possible to the original one.

It will be seen, that great skill is necessary in the use of these sources. It is not every one who can manage them with judgment and discrimination. Difficult cases frequently arise from conflicting testimonies; and the most patient investigation is required in the adjustment of them. General rules are easily mastered, but their application in many cases demands caution and maturity of judgment. Good critics, therefore, are not made at once. Training is requisite to the production of an accomplished scholar. A long course of instruction must precede high attainments in this as in other departments of knowledge. The manner in which men of acknowledged eminence have proceeded is a good example for others. Criticism is a dangerous weapon in the hands of the unskilful and

ignorant. Above all, a right spirit within is the best safeguard against error—*a spirit imbued with divine influence.*

The criticism of the Old and New Testaments might either be treated of together, or separately. But by separating them a clearer view of each is obtained. It is true that they have some things in common, and might therefore be described conjointly without great disadvantage. But they are also unlike. In the Old Testament we have a current Hebrew text from about the seventh century, and no Hebrew aids for ascending higher. In the New Testament we have a Greek text, formed by petty mending and meddling; but the Greek means of restoration take us up to the fourth century. Thus the state of both is very different. We shall therefore confine ourselves, in the present volume, to the criticism of the Old Testament.

Before giving a history of the text, which is properly the first subject that claims attention, it will be desirable, if not necessary, to speak of the language in which the Old Testament books are written. The nature and characteristic features of the Hebrew tongue should be known prior to the history of the text itself.

CHAPTER II.

THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

THE greatest part of the Old Testament is written in what is called *the Hebrew* language, because it was the language of *the Hebrews* or Israelites in the days of their independence. The people who employed it being called *Hebrews*, the application of *Hebrew* to the tongue they spoke was natural. And why were the people called *Hebrews?* Three answers have been furnished to the question.

1. Grotius, Walton and others, derive it from the verb עָבַר *to pass over*, the name having been given to Abraham by the Canaanites in consequence of his *having crossed* the Euphrates (Genesis xiv. 13), so that the word means *transitor*. This opinion was favoured by several early Christian writers, such as Origen and Jerome.

2. Others derive it from the preposition עֵבֶר equivalent to עֵבֶר הַנָּהָר *beyond the river* (Euphrates). From the preposition came the appellative עִבְרִי. In this way it means *transfluvialis*, a person who *dwells* on the other side of the river. Perhaps the Septuagint rendering of עִבְרִי in Genesis xiv. 13, viz. ὁ περάτης, favours this opinion; certainly Aquila's ὁ περαίτης agrees with it. Diodorus of Tarsus adopts it, when he explains, περάτην καλεῖ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ὡσανεὶ πέραν οἰκοῦντα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου; and in like manner Chrysostom, when he writes ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πέραν τοῦ Εὐφράτου τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχε, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περάτης

ἐλέγετο.* This view was held by several of the Rabbins, as Bechai, Maimonides, Rashi; and by Luther, Münster, Forster, Gesenius, De Wette, Winer, &c.

3. Others derive the name from Eber, so that it is a *patronymic*. Eber was son of Salah. Thus בְּנֵי עֵבֶר (Genesis x. 21) or poetically עֵבֶר stands for *the Hebrews*, the descendants of Eber. This opinion is held by many, such as Buxtorf, Loescher, Hezel, S. Morinus, Dathe, Ewald, Hävernick, Fürst, &c.

The chief objection to the first is, that even if there were evidence that the name *Hebrew* was assigned to Abraham by the Canaanites, it could not have been at first a *distinctive* name, because many tribes must have recently passed westwards over the Euphrates.

The chief objections to the second are, that it does not suit the connection in Genesis xiv. 13, because there is a contrast between Abram *the Hebrew*, and Mamre *the Amorite*, which would be lost on the supposition that הָעִבְרִי is not a patronymic. A passage in Numbers xxiv. 24 is also adverse to it. "They shall afflict Asshur and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall perish for ever." Here the Assyrians are called *Asshur*, from their progenitor Asshur; and the Hebrews *Eber*, from Eber their progenitor. It is also objected, that עֵבֶר does not appear elsewhere without the addition of הַנָּהָר *the river*. But this is of no importance, for the name is equivalent to פְּלִשְׁתִּים, from פָּלַשׁ *to wander away*. We are also reminded, that in the language of the Bible the Israelites are called *the sons or children of Israel*, while it is unusual to speak of *the sons of the other side of the river*. Other arguments collected and urged by Hävernick are weak.†

Against the third it has been asked, why should Abraham,

* xxxv. Homil. in Genes.

† See his Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleit. in das alte Testament, pp. 143, 144, vol. i.

who was the sixth from Eber, take his name from this patriarch rather than from another ancestor? Why not rather from Shem, for example, who is styled by Moses *the father of all the children of Eber.* To this it is answered, that Eber was a notable person. We read in Genesis x. 25, that in the days of his son Peleg, the earth was divided. Eber accordingly was the last of the patriarchs descended from Shem until the dividing of the peoples, from whom dates the commencement of a particular race which was selected and preserved as a distinct people among the multitudinous branches into which the general mass of mankind was divided. When therefore Eber is regarded as standing between the patriarchs descended from Shem, and the particular family whence God's peculiar people lineally sprang, and to which, when the ancient inhabitants of the earth were dispersed far and wide, the sacred history is restricted, it is not surprising that he was thought to be a person of so much importance as to give a name to his whole posterity.

Without entering into a discussion of these views and objections, it may be sufficient to mention, that the Hebrew genealogists explain the name as a *patronymic.* In this way only could they say, *sons of Eber* (Genesis x. 21; Numbers xxiv. 24). Gesenius himself admits that the Hebrew genealogists adopt this explanation.* Whether they were right is another question with him. Supposing, as he does, that the history in Genesis is mythical, he differs from the genealogists whose accounts are incorporated with the first book of Moses. But it is more likely that they were right, than the later Jews who made the Septuagint version and gave περάτης.

The name *Hebrew*, applied to the language, does not occur in the Old Testament. It was in use among those who were not Israelites. In one passage the Hebrew is poetically termed *language of Canaan* (Isaiah xix. 18), from the country in

* See his Hebräische Grammatik, thirteenth edition, p. 6.

which it was spoken; where Canaan, the holy land, is opposed to Egypt, the profane. The more common name by which the Hebrew language is designated in the Old Testament is *Jewish*, יְהוּדִית, used adverbially, *i.e.*, to speak *in Jewish*, *Judaice;* 2 Kings xviii. 26, 28; Isaiah xxxvi. 11, 13. This is in accordance with the later usage which arose after the removal of the ten tribes; when the appellations Judah and Jew were extended to the whole nation, though strictly speaking they referred only to the kingdom of Judah.

The name *Hebrew* is first applied to the language in the Apocryphal writings composed in Greek. In the prologue of Sirach we find Ἑβραϊστὶ *in Hebrew*. The same adverb is employed in the New Testament, John v. 2; xix. 13, 17, 20; and the corresponding phrase Ἑβραΐς διάλεκτος, Acts xxi. 40; xxii. 2; xxvi. 14; but in a somewhat different sense, meaning what was then the vernacular language of Palestine (Aramaean), in distinction from the Greek. In Josephus, the phrase γλῶσσα τῶν Ἑβραίων means both the ancient Hebrew and the vernacular Aramaean of the day. The appellation *holy tongue* לְשׁוֹן דְקוּדְשָׁא, *lingua sancta*, was first given to it in the Targums or Chaldee versions of the Old Testament, because it was the language of the sacred books, as distinguished from the Chaldee, the popular language, which was called לְשָׁן חֹל, *lingua profana*, *the profane language.* *

Thus we have seen that the appellation *Hebrew* language is based on the fact, that the nation speaking the dialect in question was distinguished by the name *Hebrew*. That was the first distinctive appellation the Israelites as a nation had. It was their *ethnographical* and *political* designation. But when the people were divided into twelve tribes, the early title gave place to that of *Israel*. They were then called *Israelites*, which is the *theocratic* name, or that closely connected with their religion. This use of the two appellations

* Gesenius's Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, p. 9.

is strictly observed in the Pentateuch and the oldest historical books. After the deportation of the ten tribes, *Jews* came to be used for Israelites. But the ancient name *Hebrews* was revived not long before the Christian era, "when, however, it also served to distinguish the Jews of Palestine from the Hellenist Jews, and passed over, together with that of *Jews*, to the classical writers."*

The Hebrew is only a small branch of the great trunk-language which was originally spread over the extensive territory reaching from the Mediterranean Sea to the Tigris, and northward from the Armenian Mountains to the Southern Ocean. The countries called Hither Asia or *the East* in its limited sense, were covered by this parent language. This results from the fact of the people or nation, whose national idiom it was, being a branch of the race scattered over that extent of territory. Some difficulty has been felt in obtaining an appropriate name for this parent-language and the peoples who employed it. It has been called *Shemitic*, and the race Shemites, because we find in Genesis x. 21, &c., that most of the nations who spoke it were derived from Shem. This appellation has been generally adopted, though it is historically inexact. Others and better ones have been proposed by Hupfeld and Ewald, without obtaining general currency.

The Shemitic trunk-language was bordered on the east and north by another still more widely extended, which spread itself from India to the west of Europe, and is commonly called *Indo-Germanic*. Between the two there are certain broad features of distinction, by means of which they are divided off from one another.

The grammatical character of the Shemitic parent-language mainly consists in these peculiarities :—

(*a*.) In the consonant-system, a greater multiplicity of gut-

* Dr. Nicholson, in Kitto's Cyclopædia, vol. i. p. 823.

tural aspirations and other primitive sounds is to be found than in any other language; while the vowel-system proceeds from the same three primary sounds, *a*, *i*, *u*, as the Indo-Germanic family.

(*b.*) In its written form the vowel-notation did not keep pace with the development of the language. Little points and strokes were *subordinated* to the consonants, while other languages invented distinct letters for the vowels added to them in the progress of time.

(*c.*) An uniform root-formation by three letters or two syllables, developed itself out of the original monosyllabic state, by the addition of a third letter. This tendency to enlargement presents itself in the Indo-Germanic also; but there is this difference, that in the latter monosyllabic roots remain besides those that have been enlarged; while in the former they have almost disappeared.

(*d.*) There is an almost total want of compounds, except in proper names.

(*e.*) In the flexion of verbs, there is a poverty in time-forms or tenses, which are confined to two. On the other hand, there is greater copiousness in *verbals* or forms for expressing the modifications of the simple idea contained in the verb.

(*f.*) In the flexion of nouns, there are important defects, such as, only two genders, the place of the neuter being supplied by the feminine; no proper *forms of cases*, but either a syntactical joining of two words for the genitive, or prepositions for the other cases; no forms for the comparative and superlative, except in the Arabic.

(*g.*) In syntax, we find a deficiency and crudeness in the use of particles, and consequently in the structure of periods. This, however, is not a peculiarity of the language so much as a peculiarity of the education of the people, which was more *poetic* than *philosophical*.*

* See Hupfeld's Hebräische Grammatik, pp. 3, 4.

The Shemitic family consists of three leading divisions.

1. The Aramaean primitive-dialect prevailing in the north and north-east, was preserved in two late off-shoots or forms, viz., an eastern one, the Babylonian or Chaldean; and a western, the Syriac. The Sabian, Samaritan, and Palmyrene were still later and corrupt off-shoots of the Aramaean stem-dialect.

2. The Canaanitish, to which the Hebrew, the Phœnician and its daughter the Punic, belong.

3. The Arabic, of which the Ethiopic is an older branch.

Of these leading primitive dialects, the Hebrew is the oldest so far as its literature greatly surpasses that of the others in antiquity. Whether it be the oldest in point of fact is another question, which has been much debated. Judging by *internal marks*, the Arabic has the greatest claim to be the most ancient of the three, and Mr. Forster accordingly believes it to be the oldest. But no decision can be founded on internal evidence alone.

Aramaean literature begins with the extinction of the Hebrew as a living tongue, *i.e.*, about the time of Cyrus. The literature of the Arabic language is still later than the Aramaean, viz., not till after Christ, as it appears in Himyaritic inscriptions, the Ethiopic version of the Bible, and the dialect of the Koreishites, a north Arabian race, which was elevated by Mohammedanism into the universal written language of the Arabians.*

There is good reason for believing, that when Abraham first went into Canaan he found the language current among the different tribes of the country to be substantially the same with his own. This is collected from such considerations as—

That the names of persons and places belonging to the Canaanitish tribes admit of Hebrew etymologies.

* Hebrew Grammar of Gesenius, as edited by Roediger, translated by M. Stuart, p. 5.

The same is the case with Phœnician proper names and Phœnician words, as far as they have been deciphered. The remains both of the Phœnician, and its daughter the Punic, coincide with Hebrew.

Again, the Canaanites dwelt in Palestine for a considerable period, and yet no difference of language is mentioned in the Bible. But a difference of language is spoken of in relation to other peoples. The testimony of Augustine and Jerome is to the same effect.

Still farther, the Hebrew language itself appears to present certain phenomena which imply its development in Canaan. Thus *the west* is denoted by, יָם *the sea*, and there is no other word for west.*

Did Abraham, then, take that very dialect which we call the Hebrew language with him into Canaan? Or was it the common tongue which he adopted from the tribes there, and which was afterwards more fully developed among his descendants? S. Morin, Loescher and others, affirm that the Hebrew, as it is in the Pentateuch, was the very dialect which Abraham took with him into Canaan. The strongest of their arguments have been repeated and urged in a better form by Hävernick.† All these writers do so chiefly in order to prove that Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind. But the most recent researches of philosophical ethnographers and linguists have effectually pushed aside this idea. To say that Hebrew is *the primitive tongue* is saying nothing at the present day. Hebrew is merely a later formation of the original type which gradually branched out into all historical and existing languages. Wherever the primitive type remained most fixed,—in whatever form it developed itself least, as in the Egyptian probably, there we should look for *the oldest* language, as far as historical sources can now be

* Gesenius, Geschichte, u. s. w. p. 16, et seq.

† Einleitung, § 26, p. 145, et seq.

traced. We go up to *primitive Hamism;* we look for that in its *least developed* state, and there is the highest point in antiquity to which we can go. From thence to Adam is not a very long period; but doubtless the language spoken then admitted of development. How far it differed from the Egyptian is mere matter of conjecture.*

In their contracted compass of investigation, such writers as S. Morin, Loescher, Hävernick, &c., rely on the fact, that "as the most important proper names in the first part of Genesis (as Cain, Seth, and others) are evidently founded on Hebrew etymologies, the essential connection of these names with their etymological origins involves the historical credibility of the records themselves, and leaves no room for any other conclusion than that the Hebrew language is coeval with the earliest history of man."† On the other side are the phenomena of the Hebrew language itself, shewing that its roots were at first *biliteral*, and became in progress *triliteral.* Akin to this is the argument founded on יָם, already given; and the additional fact, that the near relatives of Abraham, residing in the country whence he had recently emigrated, spoke *Aramaean* (Gen. xxxi. 47). This is thought to shew that Aramaean was Abraham's vernacular dialect.

On the whole, it appears to us that Abraham *adopted* the current dialect of the Canaanitish tribes, which his posterity took into Egypt, and brought back to Canaan. But the change from the one to the other was not great. They were merely different dialects of the same parent-language.‡

Which then of the three, the Aramaean, the Canaanitish, the Arabic, is the oldest representative of the original Shemitic trunk-language? Probably the Aramaean. For the cradle of the Shemites was the mountainous district of Armenia;

* See Bunsen, Report of the British Association for 1847, p. 297.

† Dr. Nicholson, in Kitto's Cyclopædia, vol. i. p. 823.

‡ Gesenius, Geschichte der Heb. Sprache, u. s. w. p. 16, et seq.

and their earliest abode that great plain between the Euphrates and Tigris, at the foot of the mountains of Armenia; whence Abraham the progenitor of the Hebrews went forth.

A still older representative of the primitive language is the Egyptian.

In the Old Testament, we have writings belonging to very different times. Commencing with Moses, they come down to the Persian dominion, and later. Hence arises their manifold character, at least in part. There is great difficulty in ascertaining the different periods belonging to the various remains of the Hebrew literature. It is not easy to assign each book to its proper position and era in the national history. The time when it originated can scarcely be determined with certainty, from the peculiarities of its diction and style. This results from various causes. In most pieces of the Old Testament collection, a number of circumstances must be closely examined before a right apprehension of their age be reached. And then the language itself appears to have undergone few changes from Moses till about 600 years before Christ. The simplicity of structure belonging to the Shemitic family, contributed to the inflexibility and permanence of their essential character. It is somewhat different in the case of the Indo-Germanic family. It should also be remembered, that the Hebrews were not much exposed, during that long period, to the influences which forcibly affect a language. They were not subjected for any length of time to people speaking other tongues. They lived in a state of comparative isolation from neighbouring nations, under their own free constitution. They were separated from surrounding peoples, and from all foreign languages. Hence their native language was not much altered either for the better or the worse. It was little improved; and it was little deteriorated.* Still, there are some peculiarities in the Pentateuch and other older books, which were after-

* See Ewald's Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache, p. 21.

wards modified or dropped. There are diversities between the language as found in it, and the language some centuries after, which can be recognised.

These observations will serve to justify us in not dividing the history of the Hebrew language and literature very minutely. We must take large epochs. Hävernick, who follows the brief hints of Ewald, has increased the difficulty of the subject in disposing it under the three divisions of the Mosaic period, the period of David and Solomon, and the period of the captivity, till its extinction as a spoken language. Such divisions may be justified by the internal character of the language; but they expose the various features of it to undue prominence and diversity. It is better to abide by the older division into two periods. These are more distinguishable than three, and are quite sufficient for general purposes.

The remains of the Hebrews' sacred literature may therefore be divided most conveniently into two classes, corresponding with two periods in the history of the language. The first epoch embraces the books written before the Babylonish captivity; the second, those which were composed during and after that time. These are the *golden* and *silver* ages of the language. The *golden* age embraces, of historical writings, the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Ruth; of the prophets, Jonah, Hosea, Amos, Joel, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; of the poetical writings, the earlier Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, and Job.

It will be obvious to all that the apportionment of books to the two periods respectively, is a matter of some uncertainty. Some writings may be placed in the golden or in the silver age, according to the judgment, taste, or fancy of critics. And some are differently distributed because the separating line is not very definite. All that can be done is an approximation to certainty in the proposed classification.

It is somewhat remarkable, that in the earliest existing monuments, which are undoubtedly the Mosaic books, the language appears in a form that presupposes a series of successive changes, by means of which it had deviated considerably from its original state. It is *fully developed* in the Pentateuch. Hence arises the presumption, that the writing of the Hebrews was very ancient. It did not begin with Moses or his time. Alphabetical writing was of much earlier existence among them. In these oldest existing monuments, the Hebrew language is as firmly and definitely developed as if it had long been written. And it is inferred that it had been so. There were documents prior to Moses. It may be supposed that they contained records and genealogies of the nation's history. The writer of the Pentateuch drew from them. He consulted histories and genealogical tables preserved among the posterity of Abraham. All analogy is opposed to the idea that the Hebrew attained the regularity of structure and syntax which it presents in the Mosaic books, *at once*. It did not burst forth suddenly in this high state of refinement. A considerable time was required for its gradual unfolding, till it came to be spoken and written in that mature condition. It passed through the process of centuries, being slowly and successively developed amid the various influences to which it was exposed. Hence the Pentateuch, especially in some of the oldest poems or fragments of poems incorporated into it, exhibits some *archaisms*. Thus הוּא and נַהַר were then of the common gender. There are also harsh and stiff forms, which were subsequently softened. Such archaisms and stiffness are most apparent in Exodus xv. While, however, they corroborate the opinion that Hebrew literature did not commence with Moses, they are exceptions to the general character of the language, which is clear, simple, and elegant.

To *the silver* age belong Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, some of the Psalms, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Chronicles.

The Aramaean element is the characteristic feature which distinguishes the language of this period. When the political independence of the nation sank, the theocratic spirit sank at the same time. In accordance with this degeneracy, the force and originality of the national ideas, as well as the prevalent purity of taste, became less. This deterioration is observable even in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who, in point of language, stand on the borders of the two ages. It is still more noticeable in Daniel and the post-exile *prophets* Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, as well as the later *Psalms*. *History* too becomes annalistic, compilatory, mechanical, as in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther.

The Hebrew language exhibits a twofold diction, that of poetry and prose. This distinction may be traced both in the earlier and later Hebrew. It does not appear that Hebrew poetry had *metres*. Long and short syllables, and the varieties thence arising, did not belong to it. Its characteristics are a certain rythm, consisting in measured parallel members; as well as peculiar words, forms and significations of words, and grammatical constructions. Most of these peculiarities occur in other dialects, particularly the Aramaean, as the usual modes of expression, so that they may be regarded partly as archaisms retained in poetry, and partly as transferred from Aramaean by the poets who knew it.

In regard to rythm and language, the prophets belonging to the golden age are almost poets, except that the sentences frequently run on longer, and the parallelism is less regular than in those who are properly poets. The later prophets approach nearer to the language of prose.*

Whether the Hebrew had *dialects*, can scarcely be determined, because of the scanty remains of it we possess. It is probable, however, that it exhibited such varieties. The dialect of the north may have inclined to Aramaean. There is

* See Roediger's Gesenius, Bagsters' translation, p. 8.

only one passage where it is expressly stated that the Ephraimites could not pronounce *Shibboleth*, but only *Sibboleth*. Here it is uncertain whether they were unable to utter correctly the sound *sh* merely in this word, and perhaps some others, or whether they could not utter it at all.

Dialectic differences are more obvious in the older writings, especially the poets. The song of Deborah exhibits such appearances. So does the Song of Solomon, and Hosea. Pieces which belong to the north of Palestine have an Aramaean colouring, shewing the influence to which those living northward were exposed. Even within the small limits of the kingdom of Judah, writers in the country like Amos and Micah, have a diction somewhat different from that more polished and cultivated one belonging to Isaiah and Joel.* This justifies us in supposing that the dialect of *the people* slightly differed from that of *books*. Of this there is an example in Exodus xvi. 15. When the children of Israel saw *manna*, they said מָן הוּא *what is this;* but the writer gives the word מָה as expressive of the interrogative *what*.

After the Babylonian exile, the Hebrew language did not continue to be long spoken. It fell away as the common language of the people. But it continued for some time as the dialect of the learned and of books.

* Ewald, Lehrbuch, u. s. w. p. 20.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE HEBREW CHARACTERS.

THE memorials of the Hebrews which have descended to us present a twofold mode of writing. The one character is found on the Asmonaean coins which were struck under Simon. The other character is that used in the oldest Hebrew MSS. known, commonly called the *square writing*, כְּתָב מְרֻבָּע on account of its angular form, to distinguish it from the more flowing text which the Jews termed כְּתָב עָגוּל *round writing.* It is also styled כְּתָב אַשּׁוּרִית, *Assyrian writing*, because it was thought that it consisted of the Assyrian or Aramaean letters, which Ezra is said to have brought from Assyria into Palestine after the captivity.

The Hebrew character which appears in all existing Hebrew MSS. and printed books, is not that which was always used. Another character was employed before the present. A change was made in the forms of the letters. They were wholly altered from their first condition. How is this known, it may be asked? It is so stated in the Talmuds of Babylon and Jerusalem, as well as in the writings of Origen and Jerome, who learned it doubtless from their Rabbinical teachers. From these sources we learn that the Hebrews used before the exile an ancient character termed *Samaritan*, which was exchanged by Ezra after the captivity, for the present character of *Assyrian* origin.

Thus the Babylonian Talmud says—"The law was given

to Israel in Hebrew writing, and in the holy tongue. And it was given to them again in the days of Ezra in Assyrian writing and the Aramaean language. The Israelites chose to themselves the Assyrian writing and the holy language, and left the Hebrew writing and Aramaean language to ignorant persons. But who are those idiots or ignorant persons? R. Chasda says, the Samaritans."*

And again—"Though the law was not given by his hand (Ezra's), yet writing (that is, the form of the letters) was changed by his hand, since its name is called Assyrian, because it came up with them from Assyria. †

In like manner Origin says, that in *the old writing* the letter tau had the form of a cross,‡ meaning by *the Samaritan writing*, of which this is predicated, the *Jewish coin-writing*, as was common among the Jews. In another place he states, that in certain MSS. the word יהוה was written with the old Hebrew character, adding, "they say that Ezra used other letters after the exile."§

To the same effect writes Jerome—"It is certain that Ezra the scribe and teacher of the law, after Jerusalem had been taken, and the temple renewed under Zerubbabel, *found* other letters, which we now use, since up to that time the characters of the Samaritans and Hebrews were the same."‖

It accords with this that the Samaritans call the present square character *the writing of Ezra.*

From these testimonies which, taken as a whole, are definite enough and unpolemical, it follows that the square character was introduced by Ezra, and that it was of Assyrian

* Gemar. Sanhedr. fol. 21.2 and 22.1. † Ibid. cap. 1.

‡ On Ezekiel ix. 4. § Hexapla, vol. ii. p. 94, ed. Bahrdt.

‖ "Certum est, Esram scribam legisque doctorem post captam Hierosolymam et instaurationem templi sub Zorobabel alias literas reperisse, quibus nunc utimur, cum ad illud usque tempus iidem Samaritanorum et Hebraeorum fuerint characteres." Prolog. Galeat. ad lib. Regum. Opp. vol. iv. p. 7.

origin; the former native character of the Jews being displaced by it.

But what was *the Hebrew writing* which, according to this Jewish tradition, existed and was current before Ezra? It was *the Jewish coin-writing*, which was substantially Phœnician, called also *Samaritan*, because the character used by the Samaritans is essentially identical.

In regard to the mutual relation of the Hebrew *coin-writing* and the *square character*, as respects their earlier or later use, different views have been held.

Thus the younger Buxtorf supposed that the square character was the old original alphabet, but that even before the exile, the Samaritan character had been in use *along with* it, the former being applied to holy things, the latter to common life. During the exile the priests and learned portion of the people cultivated especially the sacred character; while those who remained behind in Palestine, from whom the Samaritans proceeded, retained the common character. The former was brought out of the captivity by Ezra, and soon spread very extensively; the latter continued for the most part among the Samaritans, though it was employed occasionally by the Jews, ex. gr. on coins.* Such was the view adopted by Buxtorf and many others—a view which was a little changed by S. Morin † and Loescher ‡ without improvement. But it has been rejected as untenable by all modern scholars. The most ancient Jewish testimonies never speak of two modes of writing being used *together*, but *after* one another.

A second view of the mutual relation of the two modes of writing is that of Gesenius, according to which the one took the place of the other. But the change was not made entirely in the time of Ezra. It was *mainly* made immediately after the exile,

* Dissertationes Philol. Theol. No. 4. (Basileae, 1662, 4to.)

† De lingua primaeva, p. 271.

‡ De causis linguae Hebraeae, pp. 207, 208.

but not *wholly*. It was a gradual thing. He admits that the tradition of Ezra is true in a limited sense; that it is very probable the new character came from Chaldea; but denies that Ezra transcribed a copy of the Scriptures out of one character into another. To account for the late use of the ancient letters on coins, he appeals, besides the slow process of such changes, to the use of the Kufic character on Mohammedan coins centuries after the Nishi was employed for writing, to the attachment to things old, and to a mercantile interest, which would lead to the adoption of a character closely allied to the Phœnician. In this way it is thought that a change of character actually took place through the influence of the captivity and of the Chaldean writing, but that it was gradual, requiring an entire period for its completion. When the Maccabean coins were stamped, the one had not wholly supplanted the other.*

In recent times this view was rejected by others, among whom Kopp is the most conspicuous. And from his knowledge of palæography, this scholar has been listened to by many. Discarding as fabulous the tradition on which the prevalent view was based, the distinguished palæographer propounded the theory, that the square character developed itself in the course of time out of the ancient character by gradual steps of transition; and that after it had gone through its organic change and attained a firm form, it was adopted by the Hebrews in the early centuries after Christ.† It is almost superfluous to say, that the view proposed by Kopp was substantially new. The conjectures of Kennicott, Bianconi, Bauer, Jahn, &c. &c., were both uncritical and unphilosophical. These scholars had no perception of the true nature of the question, as is evident to any one acquainted with their words.

The theory first developed and published by the Mannheim palæographer, attracted general attention, especially after it

* Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, § 43, p. 156, et seq.

† Bilder und Schriften der Vorzeit, vol. ii.

was ably illustrated by Hupfeld.* Indeed, the explanations and partial modifications of the latter Hebraist first contributed to its general adoption. Unfolded with great skill and singular ability by Hupfeld, it was welcomed by most Hebraists as the true solution of a problem towards which many had been groping their way before. Let us therefore look at the new and popular view of Hebrew writing which has commended itself so much to the approbation of recent critics and grammarians.

The Shemitic alphabet, of which the Hebrew is merely a branch, was not invented by the Hebrews under or since Moses, but existed long prior to his time. Neither was it invented by the Phœnicians, though they had the merit of early transmitting it to the Greeks and other European nations. It was certainly invented and used by a *Shemitic* race, because it is adapted to the peculiarities of the Shemitic languages. Gesenius and Ewald think that it was constructed and used by a Shemitic people who were at one time connected with Egypt, imagining that the Egyptian picture-writing, to which the Hebrew alphabet is allied, is the oldest. The principle observed in the construction of both is the same, except in relation to the forms of the letters. Both have a *phonetic* basis. The Phœnicians, who were very early connected with the neighbouring Egyptians, are thought by Gesenius to have been the inventors. But this is somewhat uncertain. If the language of Egypt contain the undeveloped type of the Shemitic and Indo-Germanic families, as Bunsen supposes,† there will be no necessity for finding a people who, from acquaintance with the Egyptians, constructed an alphabet after the exemplar of their writing. The descendants of Noah in the central plains of Asia, may have invented it themselves,

* Studien und Kritiken for 1830, Zweytes Heft.

† See his masterly paper in the Report of the British Association for 1847, p. 254, et seq.

having some traditional knowledge, through Noah, of the primitive writing which was taken to Egypt by a colony from the birth-place of the human race, before mankind were divided into the three families designated by Noah's sons. It is therefore more probable, that the Shemitic alphabet was developed out of the primitive type independently of Egypt, in Babylonia, whence the Phœnicians got it, and were the instruments of communicating it to other nations.

The Shemitic primitive alphabet presents itself in a threefold stage of development, while it was contributing to the formation of the present Hebrew character.

1. In its oldest, though not its original state, it exists in Phœnician monuments, both stones and coins. It consists of twenty-two letters, written from right to left, and is characterised generally by stiff straight down-strokes, without regularity and beauty, and by closed heads round or pointed. It is likely that the Hebrews adopted this writing from the Canaanites (*i. e.* Phœnicians), among whom they lived; and employed it while their language was a living one. There is a tradition in the Talmud respecting such use of the Phœnician writing, as also in Origen and Jerome. We have also a twofold memorial of it—viz., *the inscriptions on Jewish coins*, struck under the Maccabean princes,* where it is evident that the

* These coins are enumerated and described by Bayer and Eckhel. They were struck under Simon Maccabeus 143 B. C., and afterwards down to Antigonus, B. C. 40. They are only in silver and copper. The silver ones are shekels and half shekels; the copper coins are about the size of our halfpence and farthings. The type of the silver ones is commonly on the obverse—the pot of manna; on the reverse, Aaron's rod budded. The copper are much more numerous than the silver, and have a great variety of types, such as the pot of manna, a vine leaf, bunch of grapes, palm-tree, citron-tree, fruits detached and in baskets. The dates given by Bayer are "first," "second," "third," "fourth year." For example, obverse, "shekel of silver, year one;" reverse, "Jerusalem the holy." Of Antigonus, the last of the Asmonaean family, Bayer gives a copper coin (p. 183) obverse, in Greek characters, "Antigonus the King;"

characters resemble the Phœnician, and *the Samaritan character*, in which the Pentateuch of the Samaritans is written. This latter character has been preserved unchanged among them till the present day, and differs from the Phœnician, as seen on the Maccabean coins, merely by a few freer and finer traces.

2. While the old character thus continued without much change among the Phœnicians and Samaritans, it had gradually altered among the Aramaeans, and assumed somewhat of a *cursive* form, by opening the heads or tops of the letters which were closed before, so that they presented themselves as two projecting points or ears; and by breaking the stiff down-strokes, which were either upright or but slightly bent, into horizontally inclined ones, to serve for union in writing. This character appears, in a twofold form, on Aramaean monuments. It is seen as *an older* and more simple one on the Carpentras stone, where it still inclines to the old writing, and is just beginning to deviate from it by opening the heads of the letters. It is also seen, as a *younger* character, in inscriptions found among the ruins of Palmyra, departing very considerably from the primitive alphabet by the open heads of letters, and by the horizontal strokes of union.

3. The ancient character also underwent a similar process among the Jews. The Maccabean coin-writing presents some appearances of such change, where the straight strokes of some letters are broken. It is probable that the influence of the later Aramaean character (Palmyrene) contributed most to this effect, until the present Hebrew writing was formed, which

reverse, in the coin character resembling the Samaritan, "Hyrcanus the high priest." There are also coins which bear distinct traces of having been originally struck by a Roman emperor, and afterwards restruck and appropriated by a Jewish conqueror. These must be assigned to the time when Barcochab, having raised the standard of war, urged his countrymen to shake off the Roman yoke. They were therefore *originally* issued by Trajan or Adrian. See Eckhel, vol. iii. pp. 471-474.

went considerably farther in its development than the Palmyrene, by completely polishing off the points that remained from the Phœnician heads, by enlarging the horizontal strokes, and by straightening the letters, separating them from one another, and causing the alphabet to lose *the cursive* character to which it had attained. In this developed form it has received the name כְּתָב מְרֻבָּע, *square writing*, on account of its angular form.*

According to this view, the old Hebrew writing was essentially Phœnician, having been preserved, after the Hebrews had laid it aside, among the Phœnicians, and still current among the Samaritans. The oldest monuments of Hebrew writing reaching no farther back than the middle of the second century before Christ, viz., the characters stamped on the Asmonaean coins, are substantially Phœnician or Samaritan. But the Aramaean character, which had gradually assumed a cursive form, was exerting a continued influence on this old Hebrew character ever since the return from Babylon. In the progress of time it was preferred above others. It spread itself over Syria and Northern Arabia. The Jews could scarcely resist its influence, because the Aramaean literature and language were entirely supplanting their ancient speech. This constantly growing energy succeeded in wholly superseding the old writing, or rather in renewing and refashioning it. And when once received, it was superstitiously preserved as holy and unalterable in all the sacred writings of the Jews.

In like manner, the Aramaean writing is regarded in this view as an intermediate condition of the old Hebrew writing used by the Jews before the exile (which was substantially Phœnician), and the modern square character. It marks the character in a transition state. It resembles in part the ancient Hebrew writing as found on the Asmonaean coins; and in part, the modern character of existing MSS. and printed

* Hupfeld, Hebräische Grammatik, p. 33, et seq.

books. The square character, therefore, is mainly of foreign origin. It passed from the Aramaeans or Syrians to the Hebrews, not by any instantaneous or sudden exchange of one character for another, but gradually and insensibly, amid the pressure of circumstances. Time, art, and culture contributed to its formation.

The view of Kopp and Hupfeld now given rests mainly on two principles, a *cursive* or *tachygraphical*, and a *calligraphical* one. Every derivative mode of writing must be formed on both; and the square Hebrew character is no exception. The first consists in a striving after facility of writing. It is the more important and influential of the two. It works in a twofold method. The pen draws merely a hasty sketch of each figure, abridging, rounding off, and flattening the parts of it; and it also forms union-traces to serve as transitions from one letter to another, in consequence of which the length and position of some parts are altered, so that the pen can the more readily pass from one to another. The effect of tachygraphy is easily recognised. A superficial delineation of letters without attention to their minute parts; a linking of them one to another; and a prolongation or bending of the final letters to admit a freer transition to such as follow, are the chief lineaments by which it is distinguished. The *calligraphical* principle proceeds in a contrary manner. It consists in striving after uniformity and symmetry. It aims to make the height and breadth of letters alike. It separates too, the letters which had been linked together in the common writing; and it inclines to ornament the letters artificially, and to beautify them according to the prevalent national taste. Hence the general features of calligraphy are easily recognised. It goes back to the forms which had existed before the cursive principle had modified them. It aims at regularity and symmetry. Letters which had been joined together it

divides, and attaches various ornamental flourishes to them, agreeably to current taste.*

By the aid of these two principles, *tachygraphy* and *calligraphy*, which are manifest in the formation of all derivative characters, the square Hebrew writing was derived from the old Phœnician *through* the intermediate Aramaean monuments on the stone of Carpentras, and the Palmyrene inscriptions. Thus we find in it the points of the letters *blunted and smoothed off*, the *horizontal union-strokes* enlarged, figures that had been divided *rounded and closed*, the position and length of many cross-lines altered, and *final letters* introduced, agreeably to tachygraphy. On the other hand, the *calligraphical* principle is seen in the extraordinary uniformity and symmetry of the letters, their separation from one another, and in the peculiar taste which adorns them with a stiff and angular form.

At what time the Hebrew writing thus altered passed from the Aramaeans or Syrians to the Jews, it is very difficult to discover. We have seen that in the Talmud, as also in the works of Origen and Jerome, the change is referred to Ezra, who, after the captivity, is said to have *changed* the old character for the square. Hence it is called *the Assyrian*, meaning the Chaldean *writing*, כְּתָב אַשּׁוּרִית. But this tradition is contradicted by many considerations. Apart from analogy, which teaches that such changes take place gradually, under the influence of successive circumstances, historical facts are against it. We know that the Aramaean character was in use long after the captivity. Even on the Maccabean coins, the old Phœnician alphabet is seen.

Kopp fixed upon the fourth century of the Christian era. The process, as he thinks, was then completed. The square character was finally and definitely formed at that period, having supplanted prior forms. It is probable that he was mainly led to take the fourth century, because the Palmyrene

* See Hupfeld, Stud. und Kritik. 1830. H. 2. p. 259, et seq.

monuments, which exhibit the Aramaean character in its nearest approach to the square one, belong to the first three centuries of the Christian era. Hence Kopp put the latter into the century next to them.

But there are serious difficulties in the way of this time which Kopp could hardly have perceived. These did not escape the keen eye of Hupfeld, who accordingly, with greater probability, speaks of the first or second century as the date of the square character. In this opinion he seems to have been influenced by the fact, that in Origen's day the alteration of character was so old and so far out of men's memories, as to be hid in the obscurity of fable. Hence it was commonly attributed to Ezra, but by most Talmudists to God. Hence also arises the ignorance displayed in the Talmud respecting the sense of the names רעין and אשורית belonging to the old and new modes of writing respectively; for it should be mentioned that the meaning of the word אשרית especially is greatly disputed, though it is explained *Assyrian* in the Talmud. R. Judah surnamed the *holy* explains it *beata*, *beatificata*;* R. Jonah, *elegant* in its letters. Indeed the majority of the Rabbins incline to take it as an *appellative*. Both Michaelis and Hupfeld derive the word from אשר to *be firm* or *straight*; a meaning to which some Rabbins were inclined, particularly Abraham de Balmis. Others deriving it from ישר *to be straight*, *recta*, *proper*, assign the same sense. Thus the Talmudic explanation *Assyrian*, which Buxtorf and Gesenius follow, is liable to great doubt.† Hupfeld was also led to the same view in part, by the fact that traces of the present square character are found even in the Mishnah; and by the passage in Matthew v. 8, in which it is implied that *yod* is a little letter, which is not the case in old Hebrew. The last consideration appears

* Buxtorf, Dissertationes, p. 235.

† See Gesenius, Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, p. 143; and Hupfeld, Studien und Kritiken, 1830, 2 Heft. pp. 293-297.

to be the most plausible of all against the late date assigned by Kopp; for it refers, as Hupfeld asserts, either to the Palmyrenic or the square character.*

The view taken by Kopp in the modified form that Hupfeld gave to it, was afterwards adopted in the main by Hävernick and Ewald. The former, however, shifts the time still farther back than Hupfeld, for he refers the change to a period prior to Christ, in consequence of the passage in Matth. v. 8. With this the Palmyrene inscriptions will certainly agree, for the age of an inscription is not necessarily the exact age of *the writing* it exhibits. The Palmyrene *writing* may therefore be dated before Christ, a century before the earliest known inscription.†

Ewald is more cautious than Hävernick, for he says that the change took place in the first century before and the first after Christ.‡

But the view proposed by Kopp, and approved with very slight modifications by Hupfeld, Hävernick, and Ewald, has not commanded universal assent. Gesenius himself, who witnessed its apparent triumph, threw out hints respecting it, implying considerable scepticism, in his great work on the Phœnician monuments. But death prevented him from speaking fully and definitely of its correctness or baselessness.

An opponent to it appeared in the person of Herbst,§ who has stated his doubts and objections with force and candour. Such adverse considerations are entitled to attention from their intrinsic character.

First. In the days of Julius Africanus, in the first half of the third century after Christ, the alteration of writing was

* Stud. und Kritiken for 1830, p. 279, et seq.

† Einleit. vol. i. p. 291.

‡ Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache, p. 100.

§ Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften des alten Testaments, part i. p. 61, et seq.

something that had gone so much out of memory that the Jews ascribed it to Ezra. Granting that Ezra had nothing to do with it, we are yet compelled to suppose that it was not made after the end of the first century. And when the disastrous time after the outbreak of the Jewish war is considered, it could not have happened then, so that we reach the middle of the first century as the *terminus ad quem* or utmost limit. The Maccabean coins lead to the *terminus a quo*, or commencing point. This, however, is not the time of Simon, but at the earliest, the time immediately preceding the dominion of the Romans, because the coins reach down so far. And because the last of the Asmonaean coins show nothing of an alteration in the writing, we must date the commencing point of *the impulse* which affected the current mode of writing somewhat later than the latest coin, probably about the time immediately subsequent to the birth of Christ. Hence there remains so small an interval for the alteration, that the idea of a gradual formation requiring centuries for its completion must be abandoned, and a *proper exchange* of the native for a foreign character should be assumed.

Secondly. At the time when the square character is said to have been introduced, the Jewish academies in the West, as well as the East, were most flourishing. A series of distinguished teachers and scholars presided over them. Now if *the old* passed *by degrees* into *the new* writing, the change took place before their eyes. They knew the steps of transition and intermediate links between both. Yet they have handed down nothing relative to it. All that they mention is two sorts of writing, strongly marked in their contrast to each other, one of which had been used *for centuries* by ignorant persons (the Samaritans); the other by the Jews.

Thirdly. If the square character was substituted for the old at so late a period, how can it be explained that those learned men, the presidents of the academies, whose doctrines

and opinions are mainly embodied in the Talmud, did not understand the expressions רעין and אשורית, and attempted in consequence the most remarkable explanations; since these technical expressions could only arise after the square character had received its full development.

Fourthly, It is very inconvenient for the new view that a passage in Irenaeus, even so early as the second century, speaks of the *ancient* and *primitive* Hebrew letters, and so of *a distinction* between the earlier and later writing.*

In consequence of these considerations, and others which are irrelevant, Herbst objects to the opinion that the square character was fully formed in the first or second century by a gradual development, under external influence and impulse. Perhaps it has not been sufficiently considered, that if the change of Hebrew characters was gradual, *various forms* must have been used at once. One had obtained currency before another was entirely laid aside.

But what reason is there for supposing the change to have been a *gradual* one? All analogy is in its favour. It is not likely that the Jewish people should have suddenly or at once exchanged their character, to which they had been long accustomed, and in which all their national writings existed, for a strange one. And if they even did so in Palestine, there is no reason why the Jews in Syria, Egypt, Cyrene, Asia Minor, Greece, should have done the very same thing. Every consideration is opposed to the fact that Ezra made the change. It did not take place so early. The later Jews were too prone to ascribe to *him* every thing remarkable and important, at the termination of their exile, which tended to improve and

* "Ipsae enim *antiquae* et *primae* literae *sacerdotales* nuncupatae decem quidem numero, scribuntur autem quoque per quindecim novissima litera copulata primae. Et ideo quaedam secundum subsequentiam scribunt, sicuti et nos: quaedam autem retrorsum a dextra parte in sinistram retorquentes literas."—Adv. Haeres. ii. 24.

exalt them as a people. But it is highly probable that an Aramaean influence began to be exerted upon *the mode of writing*, as it began to be on the *language itself*, during and after the exile. Of course the change of character was of very much slower growth than the alteration of the language, especially as the number of learned persons was comparatively few. The Aramaean or Syrian influence was greatly increased, when the Jews lived in close connection with the Aramaeans from the time Seleucus Nicator planted colonies of them in Antioch. About 143 years before Christ, when the Jews first coined money under Simon Maccabeus, the change had not been made.* Nor had it been made at least fully 40 years before Christ, for the coins of Antigonus, the last descendant of Simon Maccabeus, bear the same letters as were used under the first prince of the Asmonean family. The change had not been made from the one to the other. It is likely, however, that the old writing had been modified during the interval from Ezra to the Maccabean princes. It had slowly inclined to the square character; especially after the canon had been completed. But the Jews were very jealous of change. They were tenacious of ancient usages and forms. Hence the little progress that had been made in that period,—a progress, however, that must not be judged of by the few characters which occur on the Maccabean coins. The more ancient and time-hallowed character would be given in these memorials. It is very probable that the character had been modified more than the coins exhibit. The alteration proceeded gradually and insensibly till the coming of Christ, and during the first century after, when we suppose that it was consummated. That it was not *wholly* so, we conclude from the fact, that we know of a number of Greek and Roman coins issued by the Emperor Trajan, restruck and bearing Jewish types, with inscriptions in the same character

* See *Jüdische Munzen* in Ersch and Gruber's Encyklopaedie, § ii. part 28, p. 27, et seq.

used on the coins of Simon Maccabeus and the other Asmonean princes.* One of these coins is in the British Museum, being a silver denarius of the Emperor Trajan, *restruck* by Simeon Barcochab. The inscription on it is in characters *precisely similar* to those on the Maccabean coins.† The coin in question furnishes an argument against the square character having then obtained *exclusive* currency. But it is no argument against *the existence and currency* of that character because the inscriptions on coins may be generally regarded as imitating the more antique. The square character may then have been used, *i.e.*, besides and along with the older one. And we are inclined to think that it was so used, and that it had obtained all but *exclusive* currency. The other was little employed. The new writing had almost effaced it. It had superseded the former. The great difficulty in supposing that the square Hebrew character was unknown in the first century, is the passage in Matt. v. 8. But if we suppose that the new had not *wholly* supplanted the old, in the time of Christ, and that even when Barcochab headed the formidable insurrection against the Romans under Adrian, *i.e.*, about 130 A.D., the Jews had not lost all knowledge of their former mode of writing, all difficulty is removed. It has been sug-

* See Bayer, de numis Hebraeo-Samaritanis, pp. 237, 238, and Supplement, 13-17 ; and Eckhel, Doctrina numorum veterum, vol. iii. pp. 471-477, where the various specimens are fully described.

† This silver denarius of the Emperor Trajan bore his bust on the obverse, inscribed "Trajans, Aug. Ger. Dac. P. M. Imp." On the reverse was the figure of Arabia, with a camel standing close to her on her right, over which Arabia stretches her arm, holding in it a branch, with the inscription continued from the obverse, "Cos. v. P. P ; S. P. Q. R. Optimo Princ." On the obverse the coin now bears a bunch of grapes, with the word in the Samaritan character "Simion." On the reverse are two trumpets ; and in the same character, "Lacharuth Yerushalayim," 'Of the Liberation of Jerusalem." See a paper in the Numismatic Chronicle for October 1851, by Richard Sainthill, Esq., p. 95, who has obligingly furnished the writer with a cast of the coin in sulphur.

gested, also, that ἰωτα might refer to the Greek letter, and have been substituted in the translation for a Hebrew proverbial expression.

As to the Jewish Rabbins in the Talmud speaking of the one character as *the old*, and the other as *Assyrian*, *i.e.*, Chaldean, there is not much difficulty in reconciling their expressions with the fact that the change was *completed* at the close of the first century. They might speak very well of *the ancient* character before it had become obsolete. And they were so dependent on the traditions handed down, and so prone to fictitious legends, that little reliance can be placed on their declarations. Their statements must be received with caution and discrimination. The statements of Africanus, Irenaeus, Origen, and Jerome resolve themselves into Jewish tradition. They were derived from Jewish sources. On the whole, the change which took centuries for its consummation—the time being longer among a people like the Jews, than it would have been among other nations—was probably completed in the first half of the second of the Christian era. Both characters must therefore have been used in the century before Christ and the one after.

The coin of Barcochab seems to us fatal to the view of Gesenius, and to that of all who think that Ezra changed the one writing for the other.

Many writers have not attended to the fact that the Hebrew square did *not* come directly and immediately from what is termed the Samaritan; and that the coin-character of the Maccabees is not exactly the same as the proper Samaritan. The present square character comes from a more ancient type through Aramaean influence. It was modified and moulded chiefly by *the Palmyrene*, or that form of the Aramaean which is found on monuments belonging to Palmyra.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HEBREW VOWELS.

The most ancient mode of writing consisted of consonants alone—a peculiarity which could only be tolerated in a language during its rudimental state. It was the more easy for Hebrew alphabetical writing to remain stationary in this incipient state, because the vowels, in Shemitic dialects, do not define the roots, but rather their modifications of meaning—the finer and more fluctuating shades of signification—rather than the signification itself. The fundamental idea of a word was distinctly intelligible without vowels; and the peculiar modification of its meaning could be discovered from the connection of the discourse. Hence one acquainted with the language could readily supply the appropriate vocalisation. Besides, in the oldest and most frequent forms of the language, the vowels are generally very short and fine, so that consonants are the predominating elements; and two vowels might not be allowed in close juxta-position, except under peculiar conditions. But though this mode of writing was not unsuited to a language still simple and poor in flexion, the principle could not be carried out in all its strictness. Cases occurred in which it was absolutely necessary, for distinctness' sake, to *express* the vowel sound, as in the rare examples of two vowels coming together. And in proportion as the language developed itself, it would aim at making the mode of writing more complete. As vowel

sounds are intimately united with consonants, an improving language must be more prone to express them. Hence the Hebrews became gradually more accustomed to write vowels where they seemed necessary to distinctness, especially since it was absolutely impossible to do without them altogether. In this manner the vowels began to be written, though rarely and irregularly. As soon as the language began to extend itself beyond its imperfect rudimental form, the vowels were expressed in certain positions, corresponding to the improved form the language itself assumed.

But no new letters were invented for this purpose. Consonants already existing were used as vowel signs. The alphabet was not enlarged with new characters. Old ones were employed as representatives of vowels. And such consonants were selected as exhibited sounds approaching nearest to the vowels, or with which the vowels most easily accorded.

Like all primitive tongues, the Hebrew had at first only the three leading vowel sounds a, i, u. Of these the last two were oftenest designated in writing by proper letters. י and ו were used as the vowel letters of î and û, because the sound of them as consonants is little more than a hardening of the vowels î and û. To express â, א as being the weakest guttural, and coming nearest to the vowels, was used. Yet the adoption of א for â was exceedingly rare, because a, as the nearest vowel, appears least to require expression in writing. So rare was this use of א for â, that the ground-vowel â can scarcely be said to have had א for its own proper vowel letter. Perhaps ה the next weakest guttural to א was sometimes, though rarely, employed to represent the same fundamental vowel sound. As the oldest Hebrew writing was a sort of *syllable-writing*, in which every letter was oftenest uttered with the very simple vowel tone a, the proper vowel â required a representative letter the seldomest. It was more frequently supplied

after the consonants than î and û, and had therefore less need of a separate representative.*

As י and ו were written for the vowels î and û, so were they used for the dipthongs *ai* and *au*, which dipthongal sounds were afterwards contracted into ê and ô. But these secondary and mixed vowel tones were not represented in the written language by signs of their own. The language remained as before, ignoring this enlargement of it in its spoken state. The *written* did not keep pace with the *spoken* condition. The latter developed itself before the former. The two did not progress equally. The added vowels ê and ô were either regarded as mere helping tones to the consonants, or as modifications of i and u. In the former case, they received for themselves no particular outward designations; in the latter, the signs of î and û, viz., י and ו were employed for them. Thus the entire series of vowels, a, e, i, o, u, with all the gradations of time they had in the living language, possessed no other representatives than *vau*, *yod*, *aleph*, and *he*.

These vowel letters represented only the *long* vowels. The short ones were not written. Nor were the letters just mentioned *always* inserted where long vowel sounds actually occurred. The rule was not to write â at all. It was quite a rare case to use א for it. ו most frequently represented û. It also represented the mixed sound ô. Again, י represented î, rarely ê, which is a dipthongal sound. At the end of a word ה was oftener employed for â than א. The aspirate ה was also written for ê and ô in certain cases. More rarely did א stand for the same vowels.

Now it must be apparent to all, that the representatives of the five vowels, with all their modifications of sounds, were too few. Many ambiguities were left. The short vowels were undesignated. The absence of vowels was not specified. Whether the letters א ה ו י were used as consonants or vowels

* Ewald, Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache, p. 104.

was uncertain; and especially was it uncertain for what particular vowels or sounds they stood in particular words and syllables. But these difficulties were materially lessened, if not obviated, by knowledge of the language, and perhaps by other means.

We have observed that the representatives of vowel sounds were too few; and that they were often omitted. They were inserted only in the more doubtful cases. They were especially omitted in the oldest books of the Bible. In roots they were mostly left out; while, as a general rule, they were put at the end of words. The *scriptio defectiva* appears generally in the earlier books of the Old Testament. But the imperfection was felt less than we are ready to suppose. A vernacular knowledge of the language compensated for it in a good degree. The want of proper designations for each vowel was easily supplied. Besides, the persons who read and wrote were comparatively few. But when after the exile literary activity was awakened, and the Jews turned their attention to reading and writing—their political relations being such as diverted their thoughts in that direction—the inconvenience of the old vowel designation was felt in proportion as a knowledge of the living tongue decreased. In these circumstances they endeavoured to retain their knowledge of the current pronunciation by a more frequent use of the vowel letters, *vau*, *yod*, *aleph*, *he*, which were accordingly termed *matres lectiones* (mothers or sources of [correct] reading). This orthography appears in the later books of the Old Testament composed about the time of the captivity. It is also seen in a greater degree in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the later Talmudic and Rabbinic dialect. But the Hebrew language soon ceased to be a living one. It existed henceforward only as the language of books. Hence it became more difficult to retain the true pronunciation without other designations of tone. The use also of the sacred books in the synagogue required a definite explanation; and

as the ambiguity of the ancient Scriptures became more perplexing, the want of a more complete vocalisation became the more urgent. External circumstances conspired to make the deficiencies in the mode of writing doubly felt. The Jews were scattered abroad among strange peoples, and clung all the more closely to their ancient traditions, in proportion as successive centuries made it more difficult, even for the faithfulness of tradition itself, to retain the memory of particulars inviolate.

Under the impulse of such circumstances, an endeavour was made to supply the deficiencies of the ancient mode of writing, so that the reading of the Scriptures might be rendered easy, certain, definite, immutable. For this end, two methods presented themselves. One was, to represent all the vowel sounds or the absence of them, by delicate strokes and features in close connection with the consonants; so close, that the firmer and essential elements of words must be altered accordingly. In this way, the alphabet itself would be further developed, as was done in Sanscrit and Ethiopic. But the expedient in question could scarcely be adopted by people who had what was considered an established and sacred language. *They* would not go far in revolutionising it. Hence the Hebrews, who regarded the basis of their ancient mode of writing as inviolable, could not follow that process. They adopted therefore the only other available method, which was an endeavour to supply the nicer and more minute shades of pronunciation still wanting, by external signs, points, and strokes. This complement was superadded as an external thing—the basis of the writing, or the essential elements of words, remaining intact.*

The Arabians and Syrians proceeded in the same way as the Hebrews to obtain a vocalisation suited to their languages and sacred books. But the Arabians satisfied themselves

* Ewald, Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache, p. 113.

with three signs for the three principal vowels, a, i, u. The Syrians distinguished five vowels, a, e, i, o, u, and borrowed the five Greek figures of the corresponding A, E, H, O, Y. In both, all the vowel signs are properly short. Yet by their relation to the older vowel letters ו י א arises the idea of long vowels, *i.e.*, such as are designated by a vowel letter, or a letter serving to prolong the sound, *contrasted* with short vowels, which were expressed merely by the newly invented vowel signs.*

But the Hebrew critics went further, for they made out five long and five short vowel signs. Nor was this all. They also made half-vowel signs of a twofold kind; and furtive auxiliary tones. Thus at length a full vocalisation was developed out of the simple and original vowel elements belonging to the language. The contrivance was useful in preserving the sounds of the language as once spoken, and in helping the reader to pronounce them the more easily.

The profound reverence of the Jews for the ancient letters of the sacred books, is prominently displayed in this attempt to distinguish and preserve the sounds of their favourite tongue in their most delicate shades and relations. It is seen in their conduct as compared with that of the Arabians and Syrians. While the latter were contented with less minuteness and precision in their vowel systems, the Hebrews developed their vocalisation much further and more minutely. They endeavoured to determine, by fixed signs and rules, not only the accurate pronunciation of every letter, syllable, and word by itself, but also the inexhaustible variety inherent in the pronunciation of every word in a sentence according to the sense and connexion of the passage, so that the voice of every reader, by rigid adherence to these directions, could not err in the least. It is also seen in their leaving the written text unchanged, even where they believed it wrong. The ancient

* See Hupfeld, Hebräische Grammatik, pp. 59, 60.

text or *C'thib* they preserved inviolate, while the vowels were adapted to the *K'ri*, or text to be read. But the Jewish grammarians did not venture to introduce the signs for reading into any but private MSS. Synagogue rolls preserved the ancient form, and received no points.*

Complicated as the developed vocalisation of the Hebrews was, it could not prevent possible varieties and distinctions. It was not, and could not be *perfect*. Absolute uniformity could not be secured by it, or by any other system, however laboured and artificial. The task of maintaining the developed system unimpaired in the minutest degree, was beyond human reach. Accordingly, a comparison of different MSS. will shew minor varieties. The greatest rigidness of the Jewish doctors could not prevent copyists from diverging a little from one another, and adopting in MSS. a variety of methods. And then the scribes sought to lighten their toilsome labour by occasionally omitting the vowel signs which appeared least necessary—a thing that could be effected the more easily in many cases, because the vocalisation system is but loosely connected with the letters themselves.†

In all known MSS. that have signs, with the exception of the very remarkable one described and collated by Pinner (B. No. 3), the system appears in its present state of development. And the age of none goes beyond the ninth century, except two or three of Pinner's collation. It is also pretty certain that the vocalisation, as it now is, was preceded by more simple systems. But it is not easy to tell the *inventors* of the vowel signs, who perfected them, or the exact time when they were first adopted. Hupfeld thinks that the vowel system was developed between the sixth and tenth centuries, in the time intervening between the Talmud and the first grammarians. It arose in the East.

A system essentially similar is found among the Syrians,

* Ewald, Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache, pp. 114, 115. † Ibid, p. 115.

which belongs, at least in its rudiments, to the early times of Christianity. We know, too, that the Syrians, especially those about the Euphrates and Tigris, had schools of grammatical learning very early. In the first centuries of Christianity, those schools were flourishing, and may even have existed before its appearance. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews had their learned academies, principally among the Syrians. Hence it is very probable that the first impulse and commencement of the vowel system proceeded from the Syrians, just as the Arabians were similarly influenced. The points were not made in imitation of the Arabians, as Stephen Morin and Richard Simon supposed; perhaps not under the united influence of the Syrian and Arabian vowel-notations, as Hupfeld thinks; but solely after Syrian example. Yet as the Syrian and Arabian vowel systems flowed from one source there is no essential difference between Hupfeld and Ewald, the one asserting that traces of the Arabian influence may be discerned in the Hebrew vowel system; the other that it was borrowed from the Syrians alone. But each people developed the rudimental vowel system in its own way. Hence arose the differences in the vocalisations of the Syrians, Hebrews, and Arabians. The Hebrew system remained truer to its Syrian original than the Arabic. And we hold that the Masoretes in Palestine, especially at Tiberias, were the persons who developed and completed the present system, doubtless during successive centuries. Its country was Palestine, not Babylonia, as Luzzatto maintains. That it was unfolded by the Jews of Tiberias has been shewn by Hupfeld.* It was a gradual work, carried forward by the learned Jewish doctors till it was fully and finally fixed on a definite basis. Ewald says that it was completed about

* De rei grammaticae apud Judaeos initiis antiquissimisque scriptoribus, p. 9. et seq.

the ninth century;* but this is too early, for the first grammarians and commentators, at least the most important of them, down to the eleventh century, differ in relation to the vocalisation and the accentuation also. They are not uniform with regard to it. Indeed, old sources of information refer to the varying accent-marks, and therefore to vowel-signs in part, belonging to Tiberias, Babylon, and Palestine. Hence we suppose that there were some diversities with regard to the marks of accents and vowels among the Jews of different places—diversities which had not wholly disappeared in the tenth century. At the close of the eleventh century, we may conclude that the present system of vowels was entirely established. And if it can be referred to the Jews of any one locality as its authors, those of Tiberias have the best claim to it.† That it was of gradual growth, is proved by the testimony of Jewish grammarians themselves, who are accustomed to trace back all the vowels to three fundamental ones, viz., the three Arabic vowels â, ô, î. In the Jewish book Cosri, even the Arabic names appear, shewing the external origin of the system. "From this," says Ewald, "it is easy to determine the value of the punctuation. For later times it is a very useful aid and guide to the meaning of the old writing, whose precision cannot be sufficiently prized. It is true it is only the representation of a tradition; but that tradition is the best and oldest we know. We must set out from it, but not mistake on that account the traces of the nature and life of the ancient language at variance with the punctuation, ex. gr. those which are yet often preserved in the C'thib. For critical acumen is not the province of the punctuation, which treats all parts of the Old Testament as if they were completely alike in diction, subjects them all to the same standard

* Ewald, p. 116.

† See Steinscheider, art. *Jüdische Literatur*, in Ersch und Gruber's Encyklopaedie, Sect. ii. part 27, pp. 413, 414.

and constraint, and does not inquire whether Moses had exactly the same pronunciation as Ezra.*

It is worthy of remark that the vowel system of the Hebrews does not so much express the genuine pronunciation of the living Hebrew language in common life as that pronunciation adapted to the recitation and cantillation of the synagogue. But there was no essential dissimilarity between the pronunciation of common life and that represented by the vowel system; neither can the latter be considered a corrupt off-shoot from the former.

In the preceding observations we have considered the present vowel system only. But in 1845 a very remarkable manuscript was collated by Pinner at Odessa, in which the vowel points are quite unlike those we have been accustomed to. They are different in shape, and all *above* the consonants, accompanied with accents as peculiar in form and position. Of this MS. (marked B. 3)† the learned Hebraist gave a description and fac-simile.

In like manner Luzzatto of Padua‡ mentions some leaves containing writing with similar vowel points.

This vocalisation has been called Assyrian-Hebrew, and there is little doubt that it was used in Eastern Asia, probably in Persia or Tartary. In regard to its nature we must refer to an Essay by Ewald,§ where it is treated after his usual manner. According to this Hebraist both systems of vowel points, viz. the Western or that best known, and the Eastern or Assyrian, had a common ground, and sprang from like beginnings. Both were developed out of the same simpler and

* Ausführliches Lehrbuch, u. s. w. p. 118.

† Prospectus der der Odessaer Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Alterthümer gehörenden ältesten hebräischen und rabbinischen Manuscripte, Odessa, 1845. 4to.

‡ In J. G. Polak's *Oostersche Wandelingen* (הליכות קדם), pp. 23-30.

§ Jahrbücher der Biblischen wissenschaft, 1848, p. 160, et seq.

older elements by different schools of Masoretes in the East and West. As the Odessa MS. was completed in the year 916, he supposes that the mother-school which fixed the fundamental lines, and handed down the basis of the vowel signs, must be placed three or four centuries earlier. The time of its activity was the fifth century. But when the MS. in question was made, the Western or common vocalisation was beginning to supplant the Assyrian, for the transcriber knew it, and joined some signs of it with his own, and even used the Western continuously in some places. In Ewald's essay the differences and coincidences of both are noted, with the points in which each is preferable to the other. But the ingenious writer has constructed a theory on a very slender basis, and some of his positions are untenable, such as what he says about Kametz. We are informed by Dr. Steinschneider that in a little grammatical treatise he discovered in the Bodleian, written by Abraham Babli in the eleventh century at the latest, it is expressly stated that Kametz consists of a cross stroke and a point under it ̣, as it appears in all ancient MSS.

On the whole, there is yet a good deal of uncertainty as to these singular vowels. Hupfeld* supposes that there is no historical connexion between them and our present system, and that they are younger than it; an opinion at variance with Ewald's. We incline however to the other view, and believe that the Assyrian vowels are not younger, but arose out of the same fundamental features as the Western, both having been developed independently and contemporaneously by Jews in different countries.

Of course the accents are as peculiar as the vowel points, from which indeed they cannot be separated, and are treated of by Ewald in the same essay. Their differences from those of the Tiberias-Jews are as remarkable as the differences of the vowel-notation.

* Private letter to the Author.

If we compare the pronunciation of words presented in the Masoretic tradition, with the mode in which the Seventy and other Greek translators express it, several marked deviations will appear. Still, however, an attentive survey of the Septuagint will show that the vocalisation in it *recognises* the ancient mode of representing the vowels to which we have alluded. It is important to mark such vocalisation, because it proves that the later enlarged system is *for the most part* an extension of what prevailed when the Greek version appeared. The deviations are *exceptions* to the prevalent phenomena. The Hellenist pronunciation embodied in Greek documents presents an Aramaean colouring, in proportion as it departs from the Masoretic. Thus the changing of à into e or i is avoided, which is an Aramaean peculiarity, as גִּבְעוֹן בִּלְעָם זֶרַח תֶּרַח מִרְיָם Θαρα, Ζαρε, Βαλααμ, Γαβαων, Μαριαμ. Again e is put for a, specially where it lies in the original formation, and remains in Aramaean, as אֲהֲלִיבָמָה קְנַז גַּת Γεθ Κενεζ Ολιβεμα. In the case of ח also, ε is often put rather than α, as זֶרַח קֹרַח, Κορε Ζαρε.

For the original ĭ, e is given as in Aramaean, ex. gr. כִּתִּים מִצְרַיִם גִּדְעוֹן גֵּיהִנֹּם, Χεττιοι Γεεννα Γεδεων Μεσραϊμ.

In like manner, for ŭ, ŏ is used, as עֻזִּיָּה אֲחֻזַּת, Οχοζαθ Οζια.*

Again, the contraction of the dipthongs ai and au into ê and ô is incomplete, as Αιλαμ (עֵילָם), Θαιμαν (תֵּימָן), Γαυλων (גּוֹלָן), Ναβαυ (נְבוֹ). So also the Seventy transform yod without a vowel sound in the beginning of a word into a pure vowel sound, יְדוּתוּן into Ιδουτουν, which is done in Aramaean.

Sheva vocal also appears in the character of a rapid and fleeting vowel sound, according to its original usage.

The assimilation of vowels is also more common and comprehensive than in the later system. The principle is adopted more extensively than Masoretic practice would seem to warrant. Examples are presented by the words Σοδομα, Σολομων, Γομορρα.

* Ausführliches Lehrbuch, u. s. w. p. 116.

The inclination of the gutturals to the â sound, to which they are nearest, is not usual; and therefore patach furtive is expressed by ê.*

These deviations may be best accounted for by the fact, that an Aramaising pronunciation had extended itself in the Hellenistic period. Aramaean influences had penetrated into the language very early, and we need not be surprised at their later and more marked appearance. Whether the language had developed itself in some measure as to its pronunciation, and admitted of a living progression from the Hellenistic period till the Masoretes, so that the Masoretic pronunciation is not an exact representation of the oldest, but rather of a later one, is not an improbable supposition, though denied by Ewald.

In the Hexapla of Origen, there is the same pronunciation as in the Septuagint, though an approach to the later Masoretic system is more observable. Thus the ê sound, instead of the â, frequently occurs as an auxiliary vowel, as דְּמָעָה δεμα, גְּבוֹר γεββωρ. This sound forms an intermediate link between â and î.

The *Talmud* speaks of no written vowel signs or accents, as some have supposed. The particulars in it which have a bearing on the present subject, or have been supposed to relate to it, are these:—

1. אל תקרא כן אלא כן and יש אם למקרא, יש אם למסרת.

The first formula, "read not so, but so," relates solely to fanciful and playful changes of words in the text, so that witty applications may be made of them. It furnishes no proof that the Talmud recognises written vowel marks. The other formula is used, when two Talmudic doctors disputing, base their different opinions on the same word in the text, but according to a different reading of it; the one reading being called מקרא, the other מסרת. The former is the ecclesiastical or canonical reading; the latter the apocryphal one. The oppo-

* Hävernick's Einleit. vol. i. pp. 299, 300.

sition between the two recorded in the Talmud shews, that written vowel signs were then unknown. Both refer to the vocalisation, but in such a way as proves an unvowelled text, affording scope for interpretations deviating from the established pronunciation.

2. Another class of passages has been quoted in which certain vowel signs appear to be mentioned. These are:—

(*a.*) The Talmudic explanations of the Biblical passage, Nehem. viii. 8, where, as a means of understanding the sense of the law read in public, טעמים and פיסוקי ט״ are adduced besides the verse-division פסוקים.

(*b*). פסוקי טעמים and טעמי תורה are also mentioned.

Such expressions have been thought to allude not merely to *divisions of the sense* and *accents*, but also to *vowel signs.* But טעמים does not mean *accents*, such as we now have in the text. It denotes sententia, a logical *sentence*, and פיסוקי ם״ *incisa sententiarum*, *divisions of the sense*, or *short passages.*

Nor does סימן mean a *vowel sign*, as Tychsen supposed, but a characteristic mark to aid the memory in retaining something heard.

The Talmud does not contain even the incipient features of a written vowel-system. All the expressions which have been referred to such, need only to be rightly explained, and they will be found to involve the absence of vowel points and accents.*

In Jerome we have a witness for the state of the text in the fourth and fifth centuries, who was mainly occupied with that very subject. And *his* writings shew, that he was unacquainted with the present vowel signs, the accents, and the diacritic points of the letters. He never mentions them; for wherever he has occasion to describe words, his descriptions refer to the consonants alone. His usual expressions accordingly are, *scriptum* and *scribitur*, *lectum* and *legitur;* the

* See Hupfeld in the Studien und Kritiken for 1830, pp. 554-570.

former two referring to the letters, the latter two to their pronunciation; and the contrast implied indicating, that while the consonants were written, the vowels were supplied by traditional usage. This is confirmed by the fact of his remarking in various places, that the same word *(idem verbum*, or *sermo iisdem literis scriptus)* might be read *(legi)*, that is, pronounced, and consequently understood *(intelligi)* in various ways, according to the connexion *(pro qualitate loci*, or *locorum, pro consequentia, prout locus et ordo flagitaverint)*; or, according to the judgment of the reader *(pro arbitrio legentis, voluntate lectorum)*; and on the contrary, two words *(utrumque verbum)* as to signification, were written with the same letters. Words of this sort he calls *ambigua.* It is from such ambiguity *(ambiguitas sermonis)* that he derives the numerous deviations and mistakes of the ancient translators, particularly the Seventy, whom he blames only where their version does violence to *the letters*, or interchanges words whose letters have no similarity to one another. In giving his own version from the Hebrew, he appears sometimes undecided which is the right reading, and gives the deviations of former translators without making known his own judgment. Occasionally he indicates his opinion by *melius* or *magis*, as if one reading were more probable than another, because better suited to the connexion. Such cases, however, are the exceptions; for he is usually decided. And where he does give the grounds of his decision, he rests on these sources,

(*a.*) He is often guided by the connexion alone.

(*b.*) The authority of his predecessors, particularly Symmachus and Theodotion, perhaps the majority of them in opposition to the Septuagint, determines him.

(*c.*) Above all, the authority of the Jewish Rabbins by whom he was instructed, guided his translations. By this he was chiefly influenced, seldom departing from its voice. The circumstances indeed in which he was placed, and the mode

in which his knowledge of Hebrew was acquired, tended to establish him in the current opinions of the Palestinian Jews.

The word *accentus*, which he sometimes employs, has been erroneously taken in the sense of a *sign for regulating the reading*. But a comparison with the προσωδία of the Greeks, and *accentus* of the Latins will shew its true meaning. It refers to the *vocalisation*, and the *varying shades of ambiguous consonant sounds;* but not to written signs; for Jerome has *diversis sonis et accentibus proferuntur;* while the expression *pro varietate accentuum* is used in the same way, and of the same words as the phrase *juxta ambiguitatem sermonis si legatur*, &c.

There is another class of passages in which he speaks with express reference to the original text *(in Hebraeo scriptum est* or *habetur*, *in Hebraeo multo aliter legitur*, *juxta Hebraeicum vertimus*, *juxta Hebr. veritatem*, &c.), and rejects a reading adopted by former translators. Here he merely expresses his conviction that his own reading and interpretation are right. And there are places where he thus refers to the original, and with all his knowledge makes mistakes which could only have occurred in the absence of all written vowel marks.*

The writings of this father present a marked approximation to the Masoretic system. The earlier and simpler vocalisation appears in a more developed and definite form. Thus, the segolates are written by him as they now are, for example, *deber*, *reseph;* whereas, in the earlier vocalisation they appear with their ground forms, such as καρν for קֶרֶן. And wherever Jerome undertakes to give the exact vocalisation of the text in cases where former translations deviate from his own, he follows the pronunciation that accords with the Masoretic. Thus when he says that מים might either be read *miyam* or *mayim;* ארבה *arbe* and *arubah;* שערים *searim* and *seorim;* in such cases the interpretation he gives shews that the vocalisation

* See Hupfeld in the Studien und Kritiken for 1830, pp. 571-587.

it accords with coincides with that afterwards *written.** We know that he had learned Jews for his instructors, from whom he acquired his knowledge of the language, and whose views of the text he exhibits. They were therefore in possession of a pronunciation essentially agreeing with the present vowel system.

This father terms the letters אוי״ע ה *vowels.* But it should be observed, that he frequently calls them *letters*, or *vowel letters*, *vocales literae.* He did not look upon them as *matres lectionis*, but as quiescents, whose consonantal part was of such a kind as to be readily absorbed in their accompanying vowel sounds.†

The controversies that once agitated the learned world respecting the Hebrew vowel points are now matters of history. We shall briefly refer to the leading views maintained respecting the vowel signs.

1. Some maintained that the present vowel points are coeval with the consonants, or at least with the time of Ezra and the great synagogue. The great advocates of this opinion were the Jews of the middle age, with the two Buxtorfs, the father in his Tiberias, and the son in his treatise entitled *De punctorum vocalium et accentuum in libris V. T. origine, antiquitate, et auctoritate.* On the same side were Martini, and the Reformers Luther, Calvin, Pellican, &c. Wasmuth, Loescher, Pfeiffer, Carpzov, and many others of note entertained this view. Buxtorf was opposed by Cappellus in his celebrated work, "Arcanum punctationis revelatum," Leyden, 1624. This work contains nearly all the arguments against the antiquity of the vowel points which can be urged; and all succeeding writers have borrowed from it.

2. The modern origin of the points was held by Elias

* Hävernick, Einleitung, vol. i. pp. 300, 301.

† See an article in Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature, No. 6, p. 283, by Rev. F. Bosworth.

Levita, against whom the elder Buxtorf expressed the opposite opinion. Cappell, however, was the first to demonstrate it with irresistible arguments. This learned writer believed that they were a late invention of the Masoretes. At the same time he held that the letters אוי were anciently used as vowels by the Hebrews.

3. Others endeavoured to take a middle path. Unwilling to believe in the great antiquity of the present vowel-system in all its compass, and rejecting the idea that the Hebrews had *vowel letters*, they admitted that the ancient Jews had yet a few *vowel signs*. They assumed the existence of an earlier and simpler vowel-system.

This was the opinion of Michaelis, who assumed three vowel points in imitation of the Arabic; of Trendelenburg, Eichhorn, and Bertholdt. Others of them thought that a *diacritic point* was employed after the manner of the older Syriac and Samaritan writing. The point in question was put above or below the letters to mark the five vowel sounds, a, e, i, o, u. Such was the view of Dupuy and Jahn. Bauer inclined to it; but Gesenius was undecided, when he wrote his *Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache* and *Lehrgeb ude.* These vowel marks were regarded by Trendelenburg and Eichhorn as *very ancient;* but by others, like Gesenius, as *later.* But they all agreed in this, that written vowel signs were used before the composition of the Talmud and Jerome, in opposition to Cappell and Morin.* That there were no written vowel signs so early as the Talmud and Jerome, was demonstrated by Hupfeld with a clearness and cogency which later writers have always acknowledged. Henceforward, it is not likely that the Masoretic origin of the present vowel-system will be disputed, or the existence of an earlier and simpler *written* vocalisation asserted. The question has been fully and finally settled.

* See Gesenius' Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, pp. 182, 183.

With regard to the system of *accents*, it is closely connected with the vowel points, so far as it exerts an influence in elevating the tone of a syllable. But they were originally introduced into the language to shew the relation of single words, as well as of the verses and members. They were introduced gradually by different persons and at different times.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE history of the Old Testament text may be divided into two parts; first, the history of *the external form* of the text; secondly, the history of the text itself.

I. *History of the external form of the text.*

The Old Testament *books*, in their collected state, are divided into the *Law* (תּוֹרָה), the *Prophets* (נְבִיאִים), and (other) *writings* (כְּתוּבִים). This division is older than the New Testament, for it is there referred to under the terms, the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Luke xxiv. 44). It is also mentioned in the prologue of Jesus the son of Sirach. Without doubt, therefore, it is as ancient as the formation of the entire canon.

The Prophets are divided into נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים and אַחֲרוֹנִים נְבִיאִים, *i.e.*, *former* and *later prophets*, containing Joshua, Judges, Samuel, the Kings; and the *prophets proper* respectively. The latter again are subdivided into גְּדוֹלִים *the greater*, embracing Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; and קְטַנִּים *the lesser*, containing the remaining twelve.

The third division, called by the Greeks ἁγιόγραφα or *holy writings*, contains all the other canonical books besides those in the preceding parts.

Josephus gives the number of books in the three together as 22. This number is also mentioned by the fathers. But it does not seem to have obtained among the Jews themselves.

The order of the separate books is different among Jews

and Christians. Indeed the Jews themselves were not united in this respect. The Talmudists and Masoretes followed each a different order. The former arranged the prophets thus:—Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the twelve minor prophets. The Hagiographa they placed in this manner:—Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, Chronicles. German MSS. generally adopted the Talmudical order. The Masoretic arrangement is that existing in our present Hebrew Bibles, which the Spanish MSS. commonly exhibited.

On the other hand, the Septuagint and the fathers follow a different order, which was also adopted by Luther and our English translators.

The text is divided into smaller and larger sections. Thus the Pentateuch has been distributed into 669 *Parshioth* פָּרָשִׁיּוֹת or sections.

These divisions are called by the Jews *open* or *closed;* the former epithet indicating that they began a new line; the latter that they began on a line partly occupied with the termination of the last section. The initial letters פ and ס, which are abbreviations of פְּתוּחָה and סְתוּמָה respectively, stand at the commencement of them, shewing whether they are open or closed. It is most probable that the original purpose of *the open* sections was to mark the different topics which were successively treated in the text. They denoted the introduction of another subject. The *close* sections again seem to have pointed out the most natural and prominent paragraphs in the *open* ones, such as the change of speakers, the members of a genealogy, &c. If this be correct, it accounts for the fact that the *open* sections are much larger than the *close* ones. Such was the first attempt to divide the text agreeably to the sense.

The existence of these *parshioth* reaches beyond the Tal-

mud. Several of them are quoted in the Mishna; and in the Gemara, the difference of open and close *parshioth* is mentioned among the inviolable requirements of sacred orthography. As the practice of dividing the Pentateuch in this manner is attributed in the Gemara to Moses, it must be ancient—belonging probably to the earliest time when the sacred books were read in public.*

This division was not confined to the Pentateuch. It was also made in the Prophets and Hagiographa, for the Mishna speaks of *parshioth* in the former; and separate Psalms are called *Parshioth* in like manner.

Similar to these parshioth are the קצין or sections of the Samaritan Pentateuch; and the oldest *κεφάλαια*, *capitula*, *tituli*, *breves*, of Biblical versions frequently marked in the most ancient MSS. by empty spaces and large initial letters.

The *capitula* of Jerome, though sometimes coinciding with and derived from these Hebrew *parshioth*, are passages arbitrarily taken out of their connexion, and of very various extent. Sometimes they consist of as much as a modern chapter; sometimes of a verse; sometimes of half a verse. Hupfeld considers them as equivalent to *loci*, *passages*, or *topics of inquiry*. The *περικοπαὶ* and *ἀναγνώσματα* of Origen are like the *capitula* of Jerome. †

Different in origin and object are the larger sections or *parshioth*, which were made solely for the purpose of having the Pentateuch read through once a year. Hence there are fifty-four of them corresponding to the Sabbaths in a Jewish intercalary year. It is now ascertained that these were later in their origin than the preceding smaller sections; for they are not mentioned in the Talmud, but in the Masora for the first time. Hence too they are unknown to the synagogue rolls. When these Sabbath-sections coincide with the smaller and

* Hupfeld, Hebräische Grammatik, § 19. † Ibid, p. 94, et seq.

older sections, they are preceded by three letters; by פפפ in the case of *open*, and by ססס in the case of *close* ones. Besides the term *parshioth*, that of *sidroth* is applied to them.*

Corresponding to these *ecclesiastical* sections or *parshioth* of the Pentateuch, are the *Haphtaroth* (הַפְּטָרוֹת) or *sections* of the Prophets, which were merely lessons selected for public reading, written on separate rolls from the Pentateuch sections. They are spoken of even in the Mishna. The arrangement of them in the Talmud differs from that now current, as that of the German does from the list of the Portuguese Jews. The origin of reading the prophets in the synagogue is generally attributed to the interdict of Antiochus Epiphanes forbidding the law. But this conjecture, put forth by Elias Levita, is unworthy of credit. Whoever consults 1 Maccabees i. 41, &c., and Josephus' Antiq. xii. 5, 4, will see the impossibility of the Jews having recourse to such a practice at that time. Far more probable is Vitringa's opinion, viz., that when the Jews had been delivered by their Maccabean leaders from severe persecutions, they tried to improve the character of the public religious services by joining portions from the prophets to the law. It is apparent that in the time of Christ, the prophets were read in the synagogue; but there were then no sections or *haphtaroth* (Acts xiii. 15; Luke iv. 16, &c.) It should be remarked, that the *haphtaroth* do not embrace the whole of the prophets, as the *parshioth* do the books of Moses, but merely selected portions.

Jacob Ben Chayim, editor of Bomberg's second Rabbinical Bible, divided the entire Old Testament into *sedarim* (סִדְרִים) which are numbered and appended to each book along with the *parshioth* and verses. He made 447 divisions of this kind. But these must not be confounded with the 54 *parshioth* or Sabbath-day lessons, which are called by the same title.

* Hupfeld, Hebräische Grammatik, p. 97, et seq.

The division of *chapters* now current is of Christian origin. But it is not easy to discover the person who made it. Some ascribe it to Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1227, others to Cardinal Hugo Von St. Caro, who died in the same century. Jahn tries to unite both opinions.* The composition of a concordance for the Latin Bible made some such division necessary. From the Vulgate, it was taken by the Jews, and transferred to the Hebrew Bible. Rabbi Isaac Nathan made use of it in elaborating a Hebrew concordance; and Daniel Bomberg first put it in the printed Hebrew text in his edition of 1525.

In the poetical books and pieces, the separate rythmical members were arranged, from the earliest ascertainable period, in lines called *στίχοι*, *versus*, stichs. The first clear indications of such division are seen in Latin and Greek versions, whose existing MSS., reaching up to the fourth and fifth centuries, sometimes contain these *στίχοι*; and in the works of the fathers, especially Jerome. To write in this manner was called *στιχηρῶς* or *στιχηδὸν γράφειν*; and the enumeration of such lines *στιχομετρία*, *stichometry*. This practice, current among the Greeks, Romans, and Arabians, must also have existed among the Hebrews; because it is constantly observed in the poetical pieces inserted in the historical books (Exod. xv., Deut. xxxii., Judges v., 2 Sam. xxii.); because in the oldest MSS. the poetical books, viz. Psalms, Proverbs, Job, are so written; and because the MSS. of the Septuagint and of the old Latin version are so arranged. It was also the uniform tradition among the fathers that the division in question in the poetical books proceeded from the original authors themselves; so that it is likely the original Hebrew text furnished ground for the opinion. In our existing Hebrew MSS.

* Einleitung in die göttlichen Bücher des alten Bundes, vol. i. p. 368, second edition.

all post-masoretic, it is not surprising that the division in question has disappeared.*

A similar division is termed κῶλα καὶ κόμματα, where there is a successive series of larger and smaller sentences, or verses and half verses. This division was introduced by Jerome into the prophetical books and Chronicles; though in the latter, he employs only the *colon* or stanza, not the *comma* or hemistich.

The Talmudic פְּסוּקִים *pesukim* (from פָּסַק to cut) correspond in etymology to the Greek and Latin κόμματα, *caesa*, that is, half verses or members of verses. This seems to have been the original signification of the term. Hence it was transferred to the entire rythmical period, like the Greek and Latin στίχος, versus. In the poetical books, it was employed in this sense, as appears from tract Kiddusch, fol. 30, 1.

Corresponding to *the rythmical* division in poetical books, to which we have been referring, is a *logical* division into periods in the prose books, likewise called פְּסוּק. This division is already mentioned in the Mishna as one observed in reading the law and the prophets. In the Gemara, it is assigned to Moses himself, shewing that it had been long customary. These *pesukim* coincide with our present verses, as appears from passages in the Talmud, in which the number of them in certain sections is given; and from the number of verses enumerated as belonging to entire books; which, in the case of the Pentateuch, may be most easily reconciled with the number of these pesukim.

In addition to the *pesukim*, other divisions occur in the Gemara, termed פִּיסוּקִים, or more usually, פִּיסוּקֵי טְעָמִים and טְעָמִים alone (sentences), which are applied to reading lessons in general, sometimes to short passages or half verses within the *pesukim*.†

* Hupfeld, Grammatik, § 20.

† Ibid. § 1.

The question has been raised, whether these divisions were distinguished in the text, or preserved by oral tradition. Hupfeld is of the latter opinion, because the Talmud never speaks of external marks, such as spaces or points; because the synagogue rolls uniformly ignore them; because the observance of such divisions is treated as an art to be learned in the schools; and because the ancient translators vary in divisions of this character.* It has been assumed as a thing not improbable, that the *pesukim* of the Talmud may have been separated by small spaces, after the analogy of the close *parshioth.* From a Targum on Canticles, it appears that the decalogue only was originally written in ten lines, שׁיטים = στίχοι.

It was not till after the time of the Talmud that the traditional division of periods received its external notation in the two points called *soph-pasuk* (:). This sign is found in all MSS. and editions, with the exception of synagogue rolls; having become the exclusive token of Masoretic verses or periods. It has been even introduced into the poetical books, where it has supplanted the ancient division into στίχοι or lines, except in the case of a few poetical pieces found in prose books. That it is of earlier origin than the present accentuation-system and vowel-points, is evident from its not belonging to the accents, but being distinguished from the corresponding *silluk* by a peculiar name; from its mention in the tract Sopherim, which was prior to the period of the accents; from its occurrence in unpointed MSS. and editions; and from the analogy of Greek, Latin, and Syriac MSS. of the sacred books, where the marks of intonation appeared long after interpunction.†

The first part of the Old Testament in which numbers were attached to the verses, was the Psalter edited by James le Fevre or Faber of Estaples, and printed by Henry Stephens in 1509. In 1528, Sanctes Pagninus of Lucca published at

* Hupfeld, Grammatik, p. 106, et seq. † Ibid, § 22.

Lyons his translation of the Bible into Latin from the Hebrew and Greek, quarto, throughout which there is a division into verses, marked with Arabic numerals in the margin. The system of Pagninus was adopted by Robert Stephens in the New Testament in 1551; and in the whole Bible in 1555, with little alteration except in the deutero-canonical books and the New Testament. After this time, the practice of numbering the verses became general.

CHAPTER VI.

HAVING described the external form of the text, we proceed in the second place to the history of the text itself, which may be divided into four periods.

First, from the times the respective books were written till the close of the canon, about 200 B.C.

Secondly, from the close of the canon till the destruction of Jerusalem, and the downfall of the Jewish state, from about 200 B.C.—70 A.D.

Thirdly, from the downfall of the Jewish state, till the full and final establishment of the Masoretic text.—A.D. 70—1040.

Fourthly, from the final settlement of the Masoretic text, and the departure of the learned Jews from the east, till part of the Bible first appeared in print.—A.D. 1040—1477.

In the first period, the Old Testament books themselves are the exclusive source of information as to the state of the text, besides the Samaritan Pentateuch.

In the second, the Septuagint immediately presents itself as the chief document from which we may judge of the state of the original text. Here also belong Philo, Jonathan, and Onkelos.

In the third, we have Josephus, Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, the old Syriac or Peshito version, the fifth, sixth, and seventh Greek versions, the Mishna or text of the Talmud,

Origen, Jerome, the Gemaras or commentaries of the Talmud, the Masora, the oriental and occidental readings first printed in Bomberg's first edition of the Hebrew Bible, and the collection of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali given in the editions of Bomberg and Buxtorf.

In the fourth, our knowledge of the text is derived from the Rabbins, Moses Maimonides, Jarchi, Abenezra, Kimchi, &c. &c.

From the preceding survey of materials for a history of the text, it will be seen that the third division is by far the richest in sources of information. The first and fourth are the most barren; the second less so.

It is now universally admitted that the text of the Old Testament has not come down to us without mistake. Its absolute perfection and integrity are no longer upheld. Indeed, it requires no discernment or sagacity to perceive this fact. It is patent to the observation of every one. The Old Testament has shared the fate of other ancient books. It has been exposed to the ordinary causes which deteriorate the text. It has suffered from the mistakes of transcribers. Nothing but a continued miracle could have saved it from this; and facts shew that the Deity has not interposed miraculously to prevent copyists from falling into the slightest error. Alterations of the original text, or, as they are called, *various readings*, may be assigned to two sources. They are owing to *accident*, or to *design*. Mistakes were made *unintentionally* or *purposely*.

(*a.*) Accidental mistakes.

These include by far the greater number of existing various readings. 1. Transcribers *saw* wrongly, and therefore they *confounded* letters similar in shape. Thus *Beth* and *Caph*, *Gimel* and *Nun*, *Daleth* and *Resh*, *He* and *Heheth*, are so like that they were exchanged. Copyists also *transposed* letters, words, and sentences. And lastly, from the same cause, they *omitted* letters, words, and sentences; especially when two

clauses or periods terminated in the same way. Examples may be seen in 2 Kings xvi. 6, Psalm cx. 3, where ד and ר are interchanged; in Ezekiel xlvii. 13, where ג and ז have been mistaken for one another; in 1 Sam. xi. 9, 2 Sam. v. 24, Psalm lxxviii. 69, where ב and כ are interchanged; in 2 Sam. xiii. 37, Proverbs xx. 21, ח and ה; in Genesis xxxvi. 23, Joshua vi. 9, Psalm lxxi. 20, ו and י; in 1 Sam. xiv. 32, ט and ש. Examples of *transposition* of letters are found in Ezra ii. 46, שַׁמְלַי; Nehem. vii. 48, שַׁלְמַי; 1 Kings x. 11, אַלְמוּגִּים; 2 Chron. ix. 10, אַלְגּוּמִּים; Hosea xiii. 14, אֶהִי for אַיֵּה (see 1 Corinth. xv. 55); transposition of words in 2 Sam. vi. 2, comp. 1 Chron. xiii. 6; Ezra ii. 70, comp. Nehemiah vii. 73. Transposition of sentences occurs in Psalm xcvi. 9-11, comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 30-32. Examples of *omission* in regard to letters may be seen in 2 Sam. xxiii. 11, 2 Sam. xxii. 41, comp. Psalm xviii. 41; in regard to words in 1 Chron. viii. 31; and omission of clauses or sentences, in 1 Chron. xi. 13, comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 9, 10, 11. The technical name ὁμοιοτέλευτον has been given to such examples as the last two. When a person writing from an MS. met with the same word occurring after a short interval, he might easily fall into the mistake of omitting the intervening words.

2. Transcribers *heard* wrongly or imperfectly, and fell into mistakes. They wrote one letter instead of another, when letters were alike in sound. Hence we find א and י confounded in 1 Sam. xxii. 18, הוֹיֵג *K'ri* דּוֹאֵג; and in 1 Sam. xvii. 34, where זֶה stands in several editions instead of שֶׂה. So also in 2 Chron. xxii. 5 הָרָמִים, whereas in 2 Kings viii. 28 it is אֲרָמִים, *He* and *Aleph* being interchanged. There are seventeen identifications of לֹא with לוֹ noted in the margin of the Bible, that seem to have arisen from this cause.

3. Transcribers made mistakes from memory. In some instances they relied on it too much, wrote freely, and were

mistaken about the exact words they set down. Hence they transposed words and sentences, or omitted them altogether, confounded synonymous terms, and altered according to known parallels. Thus in Leviticus xxv. 36, אַל is confounded with בַּל; in 2 Kings i. 10, וַיְדַבֵּר with וַיֹּאמֶר; and יְהוָה with אֲדוֹנָי. Following frequent and well-remembered parallels, some copyists put למען שמך instead of מעולם שמך in Isaiah lxiii. 16; and עשרים וחמש for ששים וחמש, in Isaiah vii. 8, stands in cod. 96.

4. Transcribers made mistakes in judgment. They misapprehended the text before them, and therefore divided words badly, misunderstood abbreviations, and blundered with regard to the letters called *custodes linearum*, as well as marginal notes.

One word was improperly separated into two, or two combined into one. An example occurs in Psalm xlviii. 15, where the text has על מות instead of עלמות; *unto death*, instead of *for ever*. The latter reading is found in many MSS. and editions, the Seventy, Vulgate, and Chaldee. On the contrary, in Psalm lv. 16, יְשִׁימוּת, the textual reading denoting *desolations*, is directed by the *K'ri* to be divided into יַשִּׁי מָוֶת, *let death seize*. This is adopted by many MSS., editions, and old translators; though Hengstenberg adheres as usual to the common text.

Abbreviations were usually made by writing the first letter of a word, and appending a small stroke or two, to indicate the omission of some letters. Hence the omission was sometimes erroneously supplied; or the abbreviated word was considered complete in itself. Thus יְהוָה was shortened into י׳ or י״. In Isaiah xlii. 19, Symmachus has translated כְּעֶבֶד יְהוָה by ὁ δουλός μου, showing that he read in his copy כעבד י׳, a contraction for כְּעֶבֶד יְהוָה. So also in Jeremiah vi. 11, חֲמַת יְהוָה, *the fury of Jehovah*, is translated by the Seventy θυμόν μου, showing that it then stood חמת י׳. In Psalm xxxi. 7,

שָׂנֵאתִי *I hate*, was understood by all the ancient translators, and is in cod. 170 שָׂנֵאתָ יְהוָה, *thou, Lord, hatest.*

It is well known that the Jews did not divide a word between two lines. When there was a vacant space at the end of a line too small to contain the next word, they added letters to fill it up and preserve the uniform appearance of the copy. These supernumerary letters were generally the initials of the following word, though it was written entire in the next line. Ignorant transcribers may have taken these superfluous letters, called *custodes linearum*, *keepers of the lines*, into the text. Thus it is thought by some that in Isaiah xxxv. 1, the common reading יְשִׂישׂוּ מִדְבָּר, *the wilderness, &c. shall be glad for them*, arose from ישישו מ מדבר, by joining the superfluous מ to the end of the verb. But this is uncertain. On the other hand, transcribers suspected the existence of these *line keepers* in places where they did not occur, and omitted part of the text, So in Exod. xxxi. 8, the word כֹּל, *all*, appears to have been omitted, because of the following כֵּלָיו. The omitted word is found in the oldest versions.

Marginal annotations were sometimes taken into the text. Probably Isaiah vii. 17, furnishes an example, for the clause, אֵת מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר, *the King of Assyria*, is unsuitable.* But the clause, *within sixty-five years*, in Isaiah vii. 8, is not a gloss as some have supposed; for it may be shown that the number is appropriate.† Some have thought that the words נֵלְכָה הַשָּׂדֶה, *let us go into the field*, which are now in the Samaritan Pentateuch and several ancient versions, were originally transferred from the margin to the text; but they belong probably to the original text.

Liturgical annotations were also taken into the text, as הַלְלוּ־יָהּ.

* Gesenius's Commentar ueber den Jesaia, vol. i. p. 315.

† See Reinke, Beitraege zur Erklärung des alten Testaments, &c. § 13, p. 231, et seq.

(*b.*) *Intentional errors.*

These may be divided into two classes, viz. changes made in the text for the purpose of eliciting a different sense; and changes innocently introduced through uncritical officiousness. In the former case the intention was bad, for alterations were made by those who knew them to be *corruptions;* but in the latter, the design was good, for the alterations were intended to make the text more intelligible and better.

The Jews have been frequently charged with falsifying or corrupting the Old Testament. But the charge has not been substantiated. Their veneration for the sacred books was too great to allow them to make alterations, knowing them to be wrong. In their controversy with the Samaritans, they might have been led to change some places in the Pentateuch; and in one place (Deut. xxvii. 4), they are actually accused by the latter of falsifying the text; but the corruption belongs to the Samaritans themselves. The Hebrew text is right, the Samaritan reading wrong. The early Christians also brought the like accusation against them; but they were not competent witnesses or righteous accusers. When the Jews quoted from the Hebrew Bible passages differing from the Septuagint, the fathers found it easiest to say that the Jews had corrupted Scripture in such places. This was all the reply they could make, being themselves ignorant of the Hebrew original. It is therefore needless to adduce passages from the fathers to show that the Jews corrupted their Bible. It is particularly so to quote Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Eusebius, as J. Morin, Vossius, and others have done. The testimonies of Origen and Jerome are of more consequence, because they knew Hebrew. It cannot be denied that the former has often accused the Jews of such corruption; and that the latter has *sometimes* done so. But both writers also state the contrary in their works. We must therefore reconcile each by assuming that in one case he spoke according to the prevailing opinion;

and, in the other, according to his real convictions. He accommodated himself to the prevalent view of contemporary Christians in bringing forward the charge of falsification, while at other times he acquitted them of it.* Jerome especially, who was more familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures than Origen, did not really think that they had falsified the text, and was glad to have their aid in qualifying himself for the task of translation. The quotation below from his commentary on Isaiah will show his opinion on this point.† In his Commentary on Gal. iii. 10, he appears indeed to blame the Jews with erasing the word כל in Deut. xxvii. 26, but such does not appear to have been his deliberate opinion. And if the Jews did not corrupt their Scriptures after the origin of Christianity, it is unlikely they did it before.

There are only two or three places in which the charge of intentional corruption has a plausible appearance, viz. Psalm xxii. 17; Psalm xvi. 10; Zech. xii. 10, which will be considered in another place.

With regard to the other class of alterations arising from a well-meaning desire on behalf of the text, we see no good reason to doubt that readings apparently easier or less objectionable were occasionally substituted for others, that supposed mistakes were rectified, places where something appeared to be wanting filled up, and passages made conformable to parallel

* See Simon, Histoire Critique du vieux Testament, chapitres xviii. xix. pp. 113-124.

† "Quod si aliquis dixerit Hebraeos libros postea a Judaeis esse falsatos, audiat Origenem, quid in octavo volumine Explanationum Esaiae huic respondeat quaestiunculae: quod nunquam Dominus et Apostoli, qui caetera crimina arguunt in Scribis et Pharisaeis, de hoc crimine quod erat maximum, reticuissent. Sin autem dixerint post adventum Domini Salvatoris et praedicationem Apostolorum libros Hebraeos fuisse falsatos, cachinnum tenere non potero, ut Salvator et Evangelistae et Apostoli ita testimonia protulerint, ut Judaei postea falsaturi erant."—Comment. in Jes. cap. vi.

ones. Herbst, however, attributes corrections of this sort to less careful scribes, who, from want of attention, wrote *K'ris* instead of *C'thibs*.

Examples are found in 1 Chron. ii. 48, where, for יָלַד several MSS. read יָלְדָה in the feminine; in Levit. xxvii. 7, where, instead of אֲבִיהֶם various MSS. have אֲבִיהֶן, with the feminine suffix; in Psalm xxxvi. 2, where for לִבִּי many MSS. and versions read לִבּוֹ; in Gen. ii. 2, where for the adjective הַשְּׁבִיעִי, the Samaritan, Septuagint, and Syriac, have הַשִּׁשִּׁי; in Judges xviii. 30, where for מֹשֶׁה was put מְנַשֶּׁה; and in most of the Samaritan variations from the Hebrew. In like manner, מִמְּזֶר in Deut. xxiii. 3, was separated into מום זר; and עֹז לָמוֹ in Psalm xxviii. 8, was changed in some MSS. into עֹז לְעַמּוֹ, the latter taken from Psalm xxix. 11.

Having enumerated the sources of *accidental* as well as *designed* alterations in the text of the Old Testament, we come to *the history of the Hebrew text.*

The first period is that preceding the close of the canon.

Of the state of the text during this time we know little. Indeed we have no means of discovering it except what is found in Scripture itself. Great caution ought therefore to be applied, lest in speculating on the subject arbitrary suppositions should be freely indulged. How the separate books were preserved in relation to the condition of their texts; how often they were transcribed, and how correctly, it is very difficult to discover. May we not reasonably believe that much care was bestowed on them; and that however grievously the Jews at times departed from their God, they retained some veneration for their sacred books. The Pentateuch was always most highly valued, and to it in particular great care was given.

But we cannot suppose that the Old Testament writings were perfectly free from alterations in the earliest times, prior to their complete collection into a whole. No work of antiquity has been long kept entirely immaculate. Errors of

greater or less consequence unavoidably creep into all writings. Nor have the sacred books of the Jews escaped the same fate with others. It is probable that they had been deteriorated even in the interval between their origin and the completion of the canon. But they had suffered, less so in the Pentateuch than in the other books, before that time. All analogy confirms this assumption. In favour of it, reference might be made to the differences in proper names, as in Numb. ii. 14, where Eliasaph is called the son of *Reuel;* whereas in i. 14, he is the son of *Deuel;* in Levit. xi., where in the list of unclean birds, one appears termed דָּאָה; though in the parallel passage, Deut. xiv. 13, it is called רָאָה; in Joshua xxiv. 30, where Joshua's burying-place is תִּמְנַת סֶרַח, but in Judges ii. 9, תִּמְנַת חֶרֶס. Nor are differences in proper names confined to the Pentateuch and earlier books. Thus in Ezra ii. 2, are enumerated Jeshua, Nehemiah, Seraiah, Reelaiah, Mordecai, Bilshan, Mizpar, Bigvai, Rehum, Baanah. But in Nehem. vii. 7, there is an additional name *Nahamani;* and the list is as follows: Jeshua, Nehemiah, Azariah, Raamiah, Nahamani, Mordecai, Bilshan, Mispereth, Bigvai, Nehum, Baanah. Yet it is *possible* that most of these diversities may be of later origin than the close of the canon. They may not have existed in the text at an early period. All the examples given from the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, may be of later origin. But it is less likely to be so in the case of Ezra and Nehemiah, because on comparing the second chapter of Ezra with the seventh of Nehemiah, where the names and number of the exiles that returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua are given, it will be found that the variations are numerous and considerable.

Allusion has also been made to the parallel sections in Psalm xiv. and liii; to Psalm xl. 14, &c. as compared with the Septuagint; to Psalm xviii. and 2 Sam. xxii.; to Psalm cviii. lvii. 8-12, and lx. 7-14; to Psalm cv. 1-15, and 1 Chron. xvi. 8-22;

to Psalm xcvi. and 1 Chron. xvi. 23-33; to Isaiah xxxvii. xxxviii. and 2 Kings xix. xx. to Jeremiah lii. and 2 Kings xxiv. to Isaiah xv. xvi. and Jeremiah xlviii., and the parallel sections in the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles.

Such are the parallels adduced by De Wette, after Eichhorn, Bauer, and others, for the purpose of showing that before the collection of the books included in the canon, their text had suffered much from the carelessness as well as the rashness of transcribers. But great caution should be used before advancing assertions of this nature. The passages collected need to be examined singly and minutely, as well as in pairs, before a conclusion be drawn from them as to their original form and relation.

On comparing Psalms xiv. and liii. it will be found that the variations are *designed.* One is the original text expressed in diction simple, plain, and common; the other in polished, elevated, emphatic, rare, uncommon diction. Both proceeded from the same author; and both, adapted to different purposes, were designed to be preserved together. Hence the one must not be corrected by the other, as if either were faulty. The same remarks apply to Psalm xviii. compared with 2 Sam. xxii. where both were written by David himself. And in the case of Psalm cviii. part of it is borrowed from lvii. 8-12, and part from lx. 7-14. David himself varies these other portions, and adapts them designedly to more general relations of Israel and Israel's enemies. The 40th Psalm, 14th verse, as compared with the Septuagint, is perfectly reconcileable with it in sense. There is no reason for supposing a corruption in the text. Again, with the exception of two or three words which are wholly unimportant, 1 Chron. xvi. 8-22 agrees exactly with Psalm cv. 1-15. Here is no corruption of transcribers; and what real difference can there be between the writer of the Chronicles taking a whole Psalm or part of it to insert it in the history where it belongs, and the same

writer making use of the same composition on two occasions? If the author of the Chronicles be a compiler rather than an independent author, as is apparent, is it not consistent with his usual procedure to avail himself of the 105th Psalm, or of any other? After giving the first fifteen verses of the 105th Psalm, the Chronicle writer gives the 96th Psalm nearly verbatim; to which he appends the commencement of the 106th, as also its termination (verses 34, 35, 36). In narrating the arrangement of the sacred music in the tabernacle, "there is given the essence of those Psalms which at all times were sung, accompanied by this music, in representation of the whole Psalter. The author of Chronicles naturally formed his composition out of these Psalms which were sung in his day most frequently, and with the greatest relish. In like manner it was natural that he should not bind himself strictly to the text of the borrowed passages, but should introduce slight *variations* wherever such seemed suitable. The defence lies in this, that he does not, like the author of the books of Samuel, in 2 Sam. xxii., pledge himself to give a faithful transcript of another man's labour, but has rather published expressly an abstract by himself; and we must therefore expect it *a priori* to be given with that freedom which is manifested in selecting from Psalm cv. only the beginning, and from our Psalm the beginning and the conclusion."*

With regard to the relation between Isaiah xxxvii. xxxviii. and 2 Kings xix. xx., there is every reason to believe that the former chapters were written by Isaiah himself, and that they are the original whence the writer of Kings has deviated in unimportant particulars, making the narrative more minute, circumstantial, and chronological in arrangement. We do not imagine that the text in Isaiah is the first draught, and the other a repetition by the hand of the same writer, as Professor

* See Hengstenberg, Commentary on the Psalms, English translation, vol. iii. p. 271.

Alexander conjectures.* The author of Kings adapted the text of Isaiah to his purpose, varying it according to his idea of propriety. That he deteriorated or corrupted it, is a gratuitous assumption. On comparing 2 Kings xxiv. with Jerem. lii. it will appear that the latter is the original, and proceeded from the prophet himself. The writer of Kings took it, and altered it a little. But he did not certainly *improve* it, if the present Masoretic text be what proceeded from his hands. Probably however later corruptions have been introduced into it, as a comparison with the Septuagint will help to shew. There can be no proof that the author of the Kings, in accommodating what had been previously written to his purpose, made the text really worse, or *vitiated* it. The author of Jeremiah xlviii. has evidently incorporated a considerable part of Isaiah xv. xvi. into his composition. That a later prophet could and did make use of the predictions of an earlier one is consonant with reason, and attested by fact. The variations and alterations introduced were necessary to the special purpose of the subsequent author, which never exactly coincided with the specific design of his predecessor. In the present instance, we cannot doubt that Isaiah himself wrote chapters xv. xvi. and that Jeremiah himself, not a very late and blundering writer as Hitzig imagines, penned the forty-eighth chapter inserted in his predictions.

The parallel sections in Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, have suffered from transcribers, as they are now printed. This is certain. Corruptions have got into them which ought to be removed. Towards this object Reinke† has recently made a contribution which should be welcomed by the critic, even though it may not be successful. We receive it with gratitude, notwithstanding our hesitation to adopt the remedy so extensively as he applies it, or to believe that all the pas-

* Commentary on Isaiah, p. 538, ed. Glasgow.

† Beitraege zur Erklärung des alten Testaments, 1851.

sages he tries to restore to their original state are really corrupt. *After* such rectification, they must be judged of in the same manner as other parallels. The writers either drew from the same source, document, historical registers, or they made use of the compositions of their predecessors, freely adapting them to their purpose.

The principle by which we interpret all such repetitions is, not that they are negligent or blundering copies of the text, but reproductions of it more or less exact, made designedly, departing from the originals on purpose, that there might be an adaptation of words and matter to the special object in view. Nor were they meant to *supplant* the originals, or render them obsolete; but to stand alongside of them, and on an equal footing. In some cases, the particular design of a variation may not be very obvious, or the reason of substituting one word for another of the same sense indistinct; but an examination of the whole piece will always indicate, that the alterations generally were regulated by a certain principle. They did not proceed from mere arbitrary caprice; nor can they be ascribed to carelessness.

In judging of Ezra and Nehemiah the case is different. Here we cannot infer that the one account was reproduced and elaborated by the writer of the other. The discrepancies are too great to allow of this. Ezra's narrative must have passed through comparatively few hands before Nehemiah; so that the discrepancies could not have arisen from transcribers. The two registers present a striking disagreement, as any one may see from the mode in which the diversities are drawn out by Reinke* in full detail. They were probably derived from two different accounts of the families which returned from captivity. And if one of these lists was made at the departure from Babylonia, the other after the entrance into Palestine, discrepancies must naturally appear. The same family had not the same

* Beitraege zur Erklärung des alten Testaments, p. 213, et seq.

number of persons at different times. It is apparent from Nehem. vii. 5, that Nehemiah found an existing register of the families of the returned exiles. In it he had only to make the necessary alterations as to individuals, the families remaining the same. That Nehemiah actually reckoned the people follows from his words, "My God put it into mine heart," &c. In an *existing* register he found written the names that follow, which register he gives *after the necessary changes had been made in it.* The difference in names may be accounted for in part by one person having two names, or by one family having come into the place of another. Ezra took his account from a public document; Nehemiah found the same document, and adapted it by the necessary changes arising from the difference of times, to the existing circumstances of the families, so that he made a different list.*

These observations may account, in part, for the difference between Ezra and Nehemiah. But we are free to confess that they afford but a partial explanation. Additional circumstances must be called in to solve the problem satisfactorily. We cannot adopt Reinke's favourite remedy as the means of restoring harmony. If letters were used for numbers and occasionally mistaken for one another, *so many* mistakes of this sort *together* can hardly be assumed. We are persuaded that the cause lies much deeper than he supposes; and that no such application as his can prove available for the purpose of conciliating the two chapters of Ezra and Nehemiah respectively. His attempt however is a laudable one.† After every necessary deduction has been made, it is highly probable the text was not without mistakes before the close of the canon. To shew this, it is not sufficient to adduce a number of places where it is generally admitted that the text has suffered from transcribers or ignorant interpolators; for such deteriorations

* See Herbst's Einleitung, vol. i. pp. 89, 90 (note).

† Beitraege zur Erklärung, u. s. w. § 11, p. 213, et seq.

may have been made *subsequently* to the completion of the canon, as we have said already. It is more to the purpose to bring forward passages, which were in their present incorrect state before the Septuagint and the oldest versions appeared. If they were as they are now, even prior to the Septuagint, it is certain that they were so anterior to the close of the canon. And were we called upon to name any passages which had probably suffered at a very early period, we should refer at once to 1 Sam. vi. 19, where fifty thousand is an incredible number, far exceeding the inhabitants of a village like Beth-shemesh; to 1 Sam. xiii. 1, where we read that Saul was a year old when he began to reign;* and to 1 Chron. xxvi. 21; 2 Chron. xx. 1, 2.

But when we look at the extent of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the passages in which the text was very early tampered with, the corruptions are neither numerous nor important. Even when all the places whose corruption can be reasonably assigned to a time prior to the close of the canon are brought together, there is not much cause of complaint against transcribers and others. The treatment which the separate books experienced at the hands of the early Jews was favourable on the whole. They cannot be accused of reckless caprice and officious meddling.

The most important thing in this part of the history is the origin of that text which appears in the MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is apparent that the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Hebrew are two forms of the same text. What then is the critical value of the former? Is it worthless? Or is it generally preferable to the Hebrew? These questions cannot be

* We cannot allow of Bunsen's interpretation of this passage, viz., that "Saul was a whole year king" after the restoration of the kingdom (xi. 14), by the public anointing and recognition in Gilgal. (See Egypt's place in Universal History, p. 187, note 124.) The Hebrew can only admit naturally the translation in the text. Comp. Reinke, pp. 131-133.

answered without a diligent and fundamental comparison of both, accompanied by a sound judgment and critical tact. Preconceived opinions must not be set up instead of critical decisions. There can be no doubt that most of the older critics overrated the value of the Samaritan on the one hand, or wholly rejected it on the other, without sufficient reasons. They pronounced dogmatically as partisans rather than fair-judging critics.

In the course of a very able investigation Gesenius was the first to prove incontestably, that little value belongs to the characteristic features of the Samaritan text. He shewed that small critical reliance can be placed on it. According to his results, it is unjustifiable to use it much or generally as a source of correcting the Jewish Pentateuch. By a copious and minute investigation of particulars, he demonstrated that it cannot be employed for the purpose of emendation in the manner recommended by many. In consequence of this masterly essay, few are now disposed to attach much value to its readings, or to employ them as aids in the settlement of an uncorrupted text. Its credit in the critical world has been greatly lowered; its position as an authority depreciated far below the rank which several eminent scholars once gave it.*

The characteristic or various readings it exhibits have been divided into different classes, with numerous examples under each. The following is a summary of the results obtained by Gesenius:—

I. The first class comprehends such readings as have been conformed by Samaritan scribes to a grammatical standard mostly inaccurate.

Thus in the case of *orthography*, the quiescent letters or *matres lectionis* are inserted wherever the least difficulty might possibly arise, as מאורות for מְאֹרֹת, Gen. i. 14, 16.

In the case of *pronouns*, the unusual forms of them are

* De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole, et auctoritate, Halae, 1815, 4to.

constantly corrected, as אנחנו for נחנו, Gen. xlii. 11; Exod. xvi. 7, 8, &c.

As to *verbs*, the shorter or apocapated form of the future is changed into the common one. Thus for וַתַּגֵּד is put ותגיד, Gen. xxiv. 28; for וַיָּמֹת is put ויכוות, Gen. v. 8.

In regard to *nouns*, the paragogic letters *yod* and *vau* appended to the noun in regimen, are omitted. Thus we find שכן instead of שִׁכְנִי, Deut. xxxiii. 16; חית for חַיַּתוֹ, Gen. i. 24.

Genders are also corrected, nouns common being made masculine or feminine, as in the case of לחם, Gen. xlix. 20; שער, Deut. xv. 7, &c. Wherever נער is used of a girl, it is written נערה, as in Gen. xxiv. 16, &c.

With respect to *the syntax of verbs*, the infinitive absolute is altered into a finite verb, as in Gen. viii. 3 where for the Hebrew וַיָּשֻׁבוּ הָלוֹךְ וָשׁוֹב, the Samaritan substitutes ו׳ הלכו ושבו. And where the Hebrew has a plural noun with a singular verb, the verb is almost always changed to the plural, as in Gen. iv. 10, where צֹעֲקִים is altered into צעק.

Other grammatical emendations, not included under these heads, are enumerated by Gesenius.

II. The second class consists of interpretations or glosses received into the text. These are numerous; and not a few of them are also in the text of the Seventy. Examples occur in Gen. xx. 3, where for the Hebrew עַל־הָאִשָּׁה the Samaritan reads על אורת האשה; in Gen. xxiv. 55, where for the Hebrew יָמִים אוֹ עָשׂוֹר the Samaritan reads ימים או חדש, a *year or* a *month;* in Gen. xxv. 8, where the Hebrew text has זָקֵן וְשָׂבֵעַ, the Samaritan supplying ימים *days;* in Gen. xlix. 3, 4, where for the Hebrew פַּחַז כַּמַּיִם *the effervescence as of water* (to thee), the Samaritan has the finite verb פחזת. See also Gen. xlix. 26, Numb. xxiv. 17, &c. &c.

III. The third class consists of those readings where the text labours under some difficulty real or imaginary. Here plainer expressions are substituted. An example occurs in

Gen. ix. 5, where for the Hebrew מִיַּד הָאָדָם מִיַּד אִישׁ אָחִיו *from the hand of a man, from the hand of a man his brother*, the Samaritan inserts a copulative to אחיו, thus ואחיו, *from the hand of a man and his brother.* Another example appears in Gen. xli. 16, which stands in the Hebrew בִּלְעָדַי אֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֶה אֶת־שְׁלוֹם פַּרְעֹה, *not I* (without me) *God will answer respecting the peace of Pharaoh.* Here the Samaritan inserts a negative particle after אֱלֹהִים, thus אֱלֹהִים לא יַעֲנֶה, *without God Pharaoh will not receive an answer of peace.* The Septuagint, Syriac, and Abusaid, agree with the Samaritan. See also Gen. xlix. 10, Numb. xxii. 5, Deut. xxii. 10.

IV. The fourth class consists of those readings where the Samaritan copy is corrected or supplied from parallel passages. Here proper names belong which are written differently in the Hebrew text, whereas they are all in the same form in the Samaritan. Thus the father-in-law of Moses is called יתרו Jethro, in every case. In Gen. xi. 8, to the Hebrew text is added, *and the tower*, taken from the fourth verse. In xi. 11, &c., after *begat sons and daughters*, it is added, *and he died*, from v. 5, &c. The same epitaph is placed at the end of each patriarch.

V. The fifth class consists of those larger additions which are interpolated from parallels, in order that whatever was said or done by Moses, as recorded in a prior place, should be repeated again in so many words; and that whatever is said to have been commanded by God, should be repeated in as many words where it is recorded to have been done by Moses. In this manner the book of Exodus is much enlarged by interpolations from itself or from Deuteronomy. Gesenius thinks that these insertions were made between the time of the Alexandrian version and Origen, because Origen mentions a passage of the kind.

Here two examples must suffice :—

Hebrew.

And the Lord said unto Moses, Pharaoh's heart is hardened, he refuseth to let the people go. Get thee unto Pharaoh in the morning ; lo, he goeth out unto the water ; and thou shalt stand by the river's brink against he come ; and the rod which was turned to a serpent shalt thou take in thine hand. And thou shalt say unto him, the Lord God of the Hebrews hath sent me unto thee, saying, let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness : and, behold, hitherto thou wouldest not hear. Thus saith the Lord, In this thou shalt know that I am the Lord : behold, I will smite with the rod that is in mine hand upon the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood. And the fish that is in the river shall die, and the river shall stink ; and the Egyptians shall lothe to drink of the water of the river.

And the Lord spake unto Moses, Say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and stretch out thine hand upon the waters of Egypt, &c.—*Exod.* vii. 14-19.

Samaritan.

And the Lord said to Moses, Pharaoh's heart is hardened, he refuseth to let the people go. Get thee unto Pharaoh in the morning : lo, he goeth out unto the water, and thou shalt stand by the river's brink opposite to him ; and the rod which was turned to a serpent shalt thou take in thine hand. And thou shalt say unto him, the Lord God of the Hebrews hath sent me to thee saying, let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness, and behold thou hast not obeyed hitherto. Thus saith the Lord, In this thou shalt know that I am the Lord : behold, I smite with the rod that is in mine hand the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood. And the fish that is in the river shall die, and the river shall stink ; and the Egyptians shall lothe to drink of the waters of the river.

[And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said unto him : the Lord God of the Hebrews hath sent us to thee, saying, Let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness, and behold thou hast not obeyed hitherto. Thus saith the Lord, In this thou shalt know that I am the Lord : behold, I smite with the rod that is in mine hand the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood. And the fish that is in the river shall die, and the river shall stink ; and the Egyptians shall lothe to drink of the water of the river.]

And the Lord spake unto Moses, Say unto Aaron, take thy rod, and stretch out thine hand upon the waters of Egypt, &c.—*Exod.* vii. 14-19.

Here the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth verses are repeated in the Samaritan, so that it might be apparent that Moses and Aaron fulfilled their mission literally.

Hebrew.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's. And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking: and when, &c.—*Exod.* xx. 17, &c.

Samaritan.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, his field, his man-servant and his maid-servant, his ox and his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's. [And when the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites to which thou goest to possess it, thou shalt set thee up two great stones, and plaister them with plaister: And thou shalt write upon these stones all the words of this law. And after thou be gone over Jordan, thou shalt set up these stones which I command thee this day in Mount Gerizim, and thou shalt build there an altar to the Lord thy God, an altar of stone; thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them. Thou shalt build that altar to the Lord thy God of whole stones; and shalt offer upon it whole burnt-offerings unto the Lord thy God; and thou shalt offer peace-offerings, and shalt eat there and rejoice before the Lord thy God, on that mountain beyond Jordan, after the way of the setting of the sun, in the land of the Canaanite, dwelling in the plain over against Gilgal, near the oak of Mamre towards Sichem.] And all the people heard the thunderings and the lightnings, &c. &c.—*Exod.* xx. 17-18.

Here the inserted words are taken from the parallel in Deut. xxvii. 2-8, with a few slight changes in addition to that of Ebal into Gerizim.

VI. The sixth class comprehends passages corrected for

the purpose of removing what was offensive in point of sentiment, or what conveyed an improbable meaning in the view of the Samaritan critics.

Thus in the *Antediluvian* genealogy, none is represented by the Samaritan Pentateuch as having begotten his first son *after* he was one hundred and fifty years of age. Accordingly while the first five patriarchs are left untouched, from Jared Methuselah and Lamech a hundred years are subtracted at the time they are said to have their first son. Enoch is excepted.

In the *Postdiluvian* genealogy none is allowed to have begotten a son till after he was fifty years old. Here a hundred years are taken from Arphaxad and others, and fifty are added to Nahor, before they became fathers. Sixty years are taken from Eber.

The Alexandrine translator has also altered systematically the genealogy of the patriarchs, but differently from the Samaritan. Thus in the *Antediluvian* genealogy, wherever the Hebrew text makes one of the patriarchs beget a son before he was one hundred and fifty years old, a hundred years are added. Hence Adam is said to have been a hundred and thirty when he begat a son. In the Septuagint it is two hundred and thirty. But the hundred years added to the former part of the life are subtracted from the latter part, so that the entire age remains the same in the Hebrew and Septuagint.

In the *Postdiluvian* genealogy, the Septuagint provides that the patriarchs from Arphaxad to Terah should not beget a son till they were a hundred years old. This is in the Vatican copy; but the Alexandrine departs from it occasionally.

The following tables from Jahn* and others, will shew the differences of the Hebrew, Hebrew-Samaritan, and Septuagint:—

* Hebrew Bible, vol. i. p. 12.

	Before the Birth of a Son.			After the Birth of a Son.			Length of Life.		
	Heb.	Samr.	Sept.	Heb.	Samr.	Sept.	Heb.	Samr.	Sept.
Adam	130	130	230	800	800	700	930	930	930
Seth	105	105	205	807	807	707	912	912	912
Enos	90	90	190	815	815	715	905	905	905
Cainan ...	70	70	170	840	840	740	910	910	910
Mahalaleel	65	65	165	830	830	730	895	895	895
Jared	162	62	162	800	785	800	962	847	962
Enoch.....	65	65	165	300	300	200	365	365	365
Methusaleh	187	67	167 V. 187 A.	782	653	802 V. 782 A.	969	720	969
Lamech ...	182	53	188	595	600	565	777	653	753
Noah	500	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total ...	1556	1207	2172						
A.M.the Del.	1656	1307	2272*						

In like manner the documents vary in the postdiluvian genealogy.

	Before Birth of the First Son.				Remainder of Life.			Whole Life.		
	Heb.	Samr.	Sept.	Joseph	Heb.	Samr.	Sept.	Heb.	Samr.	Sept.
Shem	100	100	100	112	500	500	500	600	600	600
Arphaxad	35	135	135	135	403	303	400	438	438	535
Cainan ...	...	...	130	...	...	...	(430) 330	...	...	(565) 460
Salah	30	130	130	130	403	303	330	433	433	460
Eber	34	134	134	134	430	270	270 (370)	464	404	404
Peleg	30	130	130	130	209	109	209	239	239	(504) 339
Reu.....	32	132	132	130	207	107	207	239	239	339
Serug	30	130	130	132	200	100	200	230	230	330
Nahor.....	29	79	179	120	119	69	125	148	148	304 (204)
Terah	70	70	(79) 70	70	(135)	(75)	(129) (135)	205	145	205

* See Bunsen, Egypt's place in Universal History, vol. i. pp. 182, 183.

Some remarks on this genealogical table will be found in Reinke's Beiträge zur Erklärung des alten Testaments, to which the reader is referred.*

Under this class falls the passage in Exod. xii. 40, where it is in the Hebrew: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years." But the Samaritan has "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel which they made in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, was four hundred and thirty years." The same reading is in the Septuagint and Josephus. The Hebrews abode in Egypt no more than 215 years; but from the call of Abraham to the Exodus was 430 years. The correction was evidently made by the Samaritans to remove a chronological difficulty. Perhaps the passage presents no real difficulty as it stands in our Hebrew copies. It is not stated that the sojourning of the children of Israel *in Egypt* was 430 years, as many suppose, but it is simply stated that their sojourning was 430 years. The clause, "who dwelt in Egypt," is *incidental*, not *essential* to the sentence. Had the words been—"The sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was 430 years *in that country*," there would have been a serious chronological difficulty, but as they are, there is nothing imperfect or obscure. The sojourning of Israel in various places, beginning with Abraham's call and ending with the deparature of his descendants from Egypt, occupied 430 years, the space here specified. The relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר we refer with our English version to the *sons of Israel*, not to the noun *sojourning*, as the Septuagint does. Luther, De Wette, and Gesenius, by making the pronoun agree with the noun *sojourning*, rather than the proper name, have greatly embarrassed the meaning. On the supposition that the time 430 years is meant to be the time spent in Egypt itself, other places, especially Gal. iii. 17, as also

* Page 76, et seq.

Exod. vi. 16-20, vii. 7, comp. Deut. xxxiv. 7, Numb. xiv. 34, present very great difficulties in the way. Many of those who so understand it take the number 430 to be conventional and unhistorical, as Bunsen does. Others, as Ewald, take it to be strictly chronological—the accounts of the lives of the Hebrew progenitors prior to the settlement in Egypt being traditional, and historically inexact.* But we prefer the interpretation already given, although it is pressed with the difficulty that "the children of Egypt should have quitted Egypt as a nation of more than two millions of souls, at the end of 400 or even 200 years after their settlement."† We should say something in relation to this very perplexing circumstance, were it to our present purpose. The number 215, intervening between Abram's migration out of Mesopotamia into Canaan, and that of Jacob into Egypt, need not be authentic, and is not likely to be so, as Ewald supposes.

Another passage which belongs here is Gen. ii. 2, where the seventh day is changed into the *sixth* day.

In Gen. xxix. 3, 8, *all the flocks* are changed into *all the shepherds.* See also Exod. xxiv. 10.

VII. The seventh class consists of those words and forms of words in which the pure Hebrew idiom of the Pentateuch is adapted to the idiom of the Samaritan.

This is exemplified in the very frequent interchange of gutturals, in the change of the א ה ו י letters, or the addition and reduplication of them, and in the combination of two entire words without alteration. In like manner the pronouns are accommodated to the Samaritan idiom. In inflecting the preterite, future, and participle of the verb, Samaritanisms are also found. Nouns of one form or species are likewise changed for another. One example of each particular will be sufficient.

In Gen. viii. 4, we find הררט for אֲרָרָט; in Gen. xxiii. 18, בעי for בָּאֵי; Gen. xviii. 15, לה for לֹא; in Gen. xlii. 38,

* Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. i. p. 454, et seq.

† Bunsen, Egypt's place in Universal History, vol. i. p. 178.

יאגון for יָגוֹן; Gen. xii. 16, הייטיב for הֵיטִיב; in Gen. xxxii. 10, we find אלארצך *into thy land.* The pronoun אתי *thou* (feminine) occurs in Gen. xii. 13, &c. In Gen. xviii. 15, צחקתי for צָחַקְתְּ. In Exod. xxiii. 31, we have שאתי for שַׁתִּי. Nouns of the form קָטֵל are very often written קטיל, as אביל for אָבֵל, Gen. xxxvii. 35.

VIII. The eighth class embraces passages which have been conformed to the theology, hermeneutics, and worship of the Samaritans.

Thus, to avoid polytheism, the four passages in the Pentateuch where Elohim is construed with a plural are altered, so as to have it in the singular. Gen. xx. 13; xxxi. 53; xxxv. 7. Exod. xxii. 9.

Again, whatever savours of anthropomorphism or appears unsuitable to the divine majesty is either removed or softened. Examples may be seen in Exod. xv. 3, where for אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה *a man of war*, is written גִּבּוֹר מִלְחָמָה, *hero of war;* in Deut. xxix. 19, where for the Hebrew אַף־יְהוָה יֶעְשַׁן, *the anger of the Lord shall smoke*, is written אַף־יהוה יחר, *the anger of the Lord shall kindle.* See also Deut. xxxii. 8; Gen. xix. 12.

Wherever God himself is brought immediately into view as speaking and dealing with men, *the angel of God* is substituted. In Numb. xxv. 4, 5, the fourth verse is corrected from the fifth, lest the justice of God and the dignity of Moses should be infringed; and instead of "take all the heads of the people and hang them up before the Lord against the sun," we have, "order the men to be slain that were joined to Baalpeor."

Their reverence for the patriarchs and Moses led them to alter Gen. xlix. 7, and Deut. xxxiii. 12, in this way; instead of *cursed is their anger*, the Samaritan reads *excellent is their anger;* and instead of *the beloved of the Lord shall dwell*, the Samaritan has, *the hand, the hand of the Lord makes him to dwell.* In like manner, the Samaritans put *voces honestiores* in some cases where there was a fancied immodesty. Thus in Deut. xxv. 11, instead of the Hebrew בִּמְבֻשָׁיו is put בבשרו.

Here also Gesenius puts the notable passage in Deut. xxvii. 4, where the Samaritans changed *Ebal* into *Gerizim*, to favour their own temple. Some indeed have attempted to shew, that the Jews changed Gerizim into Ebal; but they have not succeeded to the satisfaction of critics generally. The most strenuous defenders of the Samaritans are Whiston and Kennicott; but Vershchuir* in particular, completely overthrew their reasoning.

Are there then, it may be asked, no readings in the Samaritan preferable to those in the Hebrew Pentateuch? Is it in every case inferior? Is there no original reading in it, which the Hebrew text does not now present?

Gesenius specifies four examples of this sort. The first is, Gen. iv. 8, "And Cain talked with Abel his brother, and it came to pass when they were in the field," &c. So it is rendered in our English version; but the literal translation is, "And Cain *said to* Abel his brother, ... and when they were in the field," &c. The Samaritan and Septuagint supply "let us go into the field," with which agree the Vulgate and Syriac interpreters. It is true that the verb may be rendered as it is in our version, *spoke to, talked with;* but the usage of it in the earlier Hebrew is unfavourable to this sense. The style of Genesis is adverse to it. There is a parallel in 1 Sam. xx. 11, which favours the insertion of the words supplied. We are therefore inclined to think that the Samaritan reading is in this case the authentic one.

The second passage is in Gen. xxii. 13, "And Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns." The Samaritan has "*a* ram," instead of the word *behind*, i.e. אחד instead of אחר. In the same manner read the Septuagint, Syriac, and all the versions except Jerome's. Probably this reading is better than the Hebrew one.

The third passage is in Gen. xlix. 14, where, instead of

* Dissertationes Philolog. exeget. No. iii.

the expression *a strong ass*, literally *an ass of bone*, גרם, the Samaritan has גְּרִים, *bony*. It is doubtful whether this should be reckoned superior to the Hebrew reading.

The fourth passage is Gen. xiv. 14, where the Hebrew is וַיָּרֶק, translated "*he armed*" his trained servants. But the verb is elsewhere applied to the drawing forth of the sword; and it is harsh to apply it to the person *who makes others* draw the sword, *i.e.*, arms them for the fight. Some render it, instead of *armed*, *led forth* to battle, as Gesenius himself does in his Lexicon. But this sense is unsupported by usage. The Samaritan has וידק *lustravit*, "he reviewed," with which the Septuagint and Vulgate seem to agree. Perhaps the Samaritan is here preferable to the Hebrew.

On the whole, this Samaritan copy cannot be put in comparison with the Hebrew one. Its deviations from the latter have in general the appearance of design. Their object may be traced. The motives to which they owe their origin can be discovered. They cannot therefore be allowed to modify or set aside the readings of the Jewish copy, except in a very few instances. The difference between the two recensions, if they may be so called, chiefly consists in additions to the Samaritan text. And we know that insertions evince design, much more than omissions. When therefore we meet with forms and phrases in the Samaritan which the Hebrew does not exhibit, it is, *a priori*, more likely that they should have been inserted in the one than purposely omitted in the other.

In placing the Hebrew above the Samaritan in most cases, it is not necessary to proceed on the supposition of the *absolute integrity* of the Masoretic text. That idea indeed is now justly exploded. We know that differences exist among the Masoretic copies. A comparison of them must be made. Nor are they sufficient of themselves to show in all instances the authentic text. Other means must be used in ascertaining it. But we cannot prefer the reading of the Samaritan to the

Hebrew, when the two disagree, except in a very few cases. Internal evidence, and a preponderance of ancient versions, may sometimes lead to the adoption of a Samaritan reading varying from the Hebrew; but it were hazardous to admit it into the text in opposition to the majority of Hebrew MSS. on the *sole authority* of the Samaritans. An authentic text can hardly be selected partly from the one and partly from the other; it should be derived *mostly* from the one, *seldom* from the other, with the assistance of all available materials of criticism. We do not strip the recension of all value; but we attach little weight to it in comparison with the Hebrew.

In accordance with this view is the general character of the two peoples. The wickedness of Israel was greater than that of Judah. The former were more addicted to idolatry. Having less reverence for Jehovah, it is natural to infer that they respected his word less. They rejected books as sacred as those they retained. They scrupled not, as we see, to make alterations in the text—from which the Jews of Jerusalem would have shrunk. They did not refrain from systematic changes, which the Jews generally avoided.

But it may be said perhaps, that the Samaritan deserves the preference, because the Septuagint commonly agrees with it where it differs from the Hebrew. And as our Lord and his apostles quoted oftenest from the Seventy, their testimony may be put into the scale against the Hebrew in favour of the Samaritan. Since they usually preferred the Alexandrine translation, with which the Samaritan agrees in opposition to the Hebrew, does not that circumstance shew the superiority of the recension with which the Septuagint coincides?

The consideration now stated may appear plausible at first sight. But its plausibility is dissipated by examination. Though the Septuagint may generally agree with the Samaritan Pentateuch, it also differs from it. We must therefore inquire into the harmony existing between the New Testament

quotations from the Pentateuch and the Septuagint; and next into the coincidence of the Samaritan with this translation in the particular passages cited by the New Testament writers. It is only when the citations of the Greek Testament agree with the text of the Seventy and Samaritan together, in opposition to the Hebrew, that an argument can be drawn to the disparagement of the Jewish copy. For this purpose, an examination was instituted of all the quotations from the Pentateuch that appear in the Greek Testament, and the result was as follows:—In nineteen passages there is no difference between the quotation in the Greek Testament and the original of it in the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint. All agree in presenting the same expressions. There is no perceptible difference in the passages as they stand in the four documents just mentioned. In three instances alone was it ascertained, that the Greek Testament agreed with the Samaritan and Septuagint, in opposition to the Hebrew. But nothing can be built on them in favour of any hypothesis, because the difference is extremely slight. For example, Matt. iv. 4, is taken from Deut. viii. 3. Here, in the Samaritan, Septuagint, and Greek Testament, is a distinct term denoting *word;* but in the original Hebrew there is no separate noun for *word.* Yet it is easy to perceive that they all amount to the same thing, for the noun *word* is *included in* the Hebrew. Another example occurs in the epistle to the Romans iv. 3, taken from Gen. xv. 6. In the Samaritan, Septuagint, and Greek Testament, the text reads, "it was counted to him for righteousness;" but the Hebrew has, "he [God] counted it to him [Abraham] for righteousness." Here, too, there is no real difference. The verb to *count* or *impute* taken actively or passively does not alter the meaning of the proposition. Again, Gen. ii. 24, is quoted in the New Testament as, "they twain shall be one flesh." Here the Greek δύο appears, which is not in the Hebrew. The same adjective is in the Septuagint,

and also in the Samaritan, where the rendering literally is, "there shall be of the two one flesh." Thus the three documents agree in inserting the numeral *two* contrary to the Hebrew text. Hence many assume that the word originally belonged to that text. But there is ground for doubt about this. The sense is not at all affected by the difference. It is all the same whether the one reading or the other be adopted. Our Saviour and his apostles, who were by no means so solicitous respecting *words* as some modern theologians are, judged it a matter of indifference, in a case like the present, to adhere to the *ipsissima verba* of the Hebrew, or to use an additional term for the sake of greater emphasis. They adopted the latter course in the present instance, without the slightest disparagement of the Hebrew, because it yields the very same sense.

These are the only examples of the New Testament, Samaritan, and Septuagint agreeing where they differ from the Hebrew Pentateuch; and the variation is so slight that it scarcely deserves the name. The difference in question being almost nothing, no argument for the superiority of the Samaritan to the Hebrew Pentateuch can be derived from the three instances. Let it be recollected also, that the New Testament sometimes agrees with the Septuagint where the Hebrew and Samaritan differ from both; so that there is no ground for placing the Samaritan above the Hebrew. Thus in 2 Corinth. xiii. 1, quoted from Deut. xix. 15, the Septuagint and Greek Testament coincide; while they differ from the Hebrew and Samaritan, both which harmonise. The same thing is exemplified in other passages which need not be quoted. It is sufficient to have seen, from the fullest induction, that though there are many places of the Greek Testament where slight discrepancies exist between the Hebrew and the Septuagint, when at the same time the latter coincides with the Greek Testament, yet the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees oftener with the Hebrew than the Septuagint. Hence nothing can be in-

ferred in favour of the Samaritan against the Hebrew from the general coincidence between the Samaritan and Septuagint, and the well-known fact that the latter is more frequently quoted than the Hebrew original in the Greek Testament.

In respect to the *antiquity* of the document whose peculiarities have just been considered, the present place may be as convenient for speaking of it as any other; though, strictly speaking, the topic does not belong to a history of the text.

Various opinions have been entertained of the antiquity of the Samaritan Pentateuch. When, and from whom the Samaritans first got the five books of Moses, is a question attended with much difficulty.

1. Some suppose that the Pentateuch existed before the separation of the ten tribes from the two.

2. Others, again, assign a much later origin to the volume. They think that the Samaritans first received it under Alexander the Great, through Manasseh. In this manner its origin is made to be contemporary with the building of the Samaritan temple.

In favour of the early date it has been argued, that the hatred which arose between Judah and Israel immediately after the division of the united kingdom, did not allow of the latter receiving such a book from the former,—that the canon of the Samaritans contained no other books than the Pentateuch,—that the request of the Samaritans to assist in rebuilding the temple implies their possessing the Pentateuch, —and that the difference of character between the Hebrew and Samaritan copies can be best explained in this way, the latter being confessedly older.*

Gesenius, as a leading advocate of the other view, set himself to overthrow all these arguments, not without success. Indeed they cannot stand the test of a rigid scrutiny. But it is to be regretted that he and many other adherents of the

* Gesenius de Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, &c. p. 3, et seq.

later origin went on the assumption of the Hebrew Pentateuch's *late date;* and even employed that as an argument against the early existence of the Samaritan copy. The arguments on which they chiefly rely are, the fact of Manasseh the Jewish priest going over to the Samaritans,—the ecclesiastical state of the kingdom of the ten tribes as well as of the Samaritans, till the building of the temple on Gerizim, which does not well admit of the existence of a written law like the Pentateuch,—and the historical analogies which are all in favour of the same view.*

That the Pentateuch did exist from the commencement in the kingdom of Israel must be *assumed* at present, as the proof of it would lead away from the subject before us. That it was in the kingdom of the ten tribes and obtained legal authority, must be taken as certain; although many acute and ingenious things derived from the state of Israel under different kings, and from the permitted usages even of the pious among them, have been advanced against the fact in question. Notwithstanding the remarkable silence regarding it observed by the sacred writers during Israel's continuance as a kingdom,—the silence of the Levitical priests, when Jeroboam established a form of worship at variance with the Pentateuch,—their absence of appeal to the law,—there are many circumstances which speak strongly in favour of the Pentateuch's prior existence. A plausible case has been made out against its existence thus early; but on a close inspection the plausibility will disappear. If then the Pentateuch was among the Israelites as soon as they formed a separate kingdom from Judah, the only question remaining for us to settle is, *how* or *when* did it come to the people called Samaritans? Much depends on *the point of time* where the application of the distinctive title *Samaritans* commences. This cannot be settled precisely. But it is usual to date the origin of it after a mixed

* Gesenius de Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, &c. p. 6, et seq.

people arose composed of the heathen colonists sent by Shalmaneser into the land of Israel and the remainder of the ten tribes not carried away by him. This was after the end of the kingdom of Israel. The prevailing element was *heathen* not *Israelite*. As to the view of the Samaritans advanced by Hengstenberg,* whom Hävernick and Robinson follow, viz.—that they were *wholly* of *heathen* origin—Esarhaddon having carried away *all* the population of Israel, including the poorest and the lowest, we cannot adopt it. Facts and analogy are on the other side. Especially does it appear to us that the records of Josiah's reign are opposed to it. Kalkar† has reasoned excellently against it, to whom we must refer for an exhibition of its weakness. So too has Juynboll.‡

Is it probable then, that when the tribes were carried away into Assyria, copies were left in the hands of the remnant, which passed of course into the possession of the mixed population afterwards called the Samaritans? If so, the Pentateuch was always among the Samaritans. Though we cannot believe that a perusal of the sacred records in Kings and Chronicles shews the remnant to have consisted of the very dregs of the Israelite population, or that they were much poorer and more degraded than those carried away into Assyria, yet it is doubtful whether copies of the law were so common in Israel as to make it probable that some were left. They must have been very rare, even before the deportation of the majority of the people into a foreign country. If any persons knew of them, the priests alone were the parties. The subsequent discovery of a copy of the law in the kingdom of Judah under Josiah, and the amazement it caused, are adverse to the supposition of copies in Israel *after* Shalmaneser

* Beiträge zur Einleit. ins alte Testament, vol. i. p. 177; ii. p. 3, et seq.

† In Pelt's Mitarbeiten for 1840, Drittes Heft, p. 24, &c.

‡ Commentarii in historiam gentis Samaritanae, pp. 12, 13.

had carried away the principal men, perhaps before his conquest.

Very soon after the formation of the mixed race called *Samaritans*, an Israelitish priest was sent by the Assyrian king to teach the superstitious people how they should fear the Lord. Le Clerc and others conjectured that *he* took a copy of the law with him, which became thenceforward the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is related of him, that "he came and dwelt in Bethel, and taught them how they should fear the Lord."* Here it is not asserted that he took a copy of the Pentateuch with him out of which he might teach them. But he may have done so. Yet it seems more probable to us that he did not. *Oral teaching* was much better fitted for the superstitious people than instruction out of a written book. It was wholly unnecessary on the part of the priest to introduce a copy of the Pentateuch among the ignorant population. He could teach them more effectually by word of mouth. Believing that he would adopt the best and simplest method for them, it is unlikely that he took the written law with him, and so gave origin to the Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch.

A few years after, Josiah carried reform not only throughout Judah but Israel, for we are informed that he broke down the altar and the high place and the images in Samaria, in the cities of Manasseh, Ephraim, Simeon, and Naphtali. The consequence of this was, that Israel (the Samaritans) served the Lord, and even sent money for the repair of the temple at Jerusalem. In pursuance of his salutary measures, after the king had read in the ears of his assembled people the words of *the book of the covenant*, he kept a solemn passover at which Israelites (*i.e.* Samaritans) were present.† Surely the Samaritans must have heard of the law at this time. The reforms of Joshua were connected with the remarkable discovery

* 2 Kings xvii. 28.

† 2 Kings xxiii. 15-20 ; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 33 ; xxxiv. 9.

of a copy; he had read it publicly before the assembled people, and bound them to the observance of its precepts; so that the Israelites who were then or immediately after at Jerusalem, could not but have *heard of* it, if they did not *hear it.* Hence it is probable that they got a copy of the law in the reign of Josiah—stimulated as they were to the better observance of Jehovah's worship by the unusual and solemn transactions at Jerusalem.

The history itself of the Israelitish kingdom is sufficient to shew that the animosity existing between Judah and Israel has been much exaggerated. It was by no means of the character frequently represented. The remnant of the Israelites, mixed though they were with the Assyrian colonists, never abandoned the worship of the true God, and kept up a partial friendly connexion with Judah even in sacred things. They knew and felt that Jerusalem, with its temple, was the appointed place of national worship; and their desire to partake of that worship there was not extinguished. Whatever animosity may have been excited at times between them, it was not a continuous thing. Its cessation on different occasions was evinced by a friendly approximation and union in public worship. This was the case preëminently in the time of Josiah, as it had been before under Hezekiah. Surely then the season of peaceful intercourse was favourable for the introduction of the written Pentateuch among the Samaritans. The time of salutary reforms in religion under Josiah, seems particularly adapted to the reception of the volume among the people whose history is before us. *

Much has been said about the Samaritans having no book of the law, because they had no priest before Manasseh. If they had neither an established worship nor priests, how could they, it is asked, have had the Pentateuch? It is agreeable to analogy to suppose that in the progress of time the state of

* Herbst, Einleit. vol. i. p. 99.

opinion among them was improved. They thought of former days, were sorry, wished to return to the God of their fathers, and to render their worship conformable to His will. Hence they would remove the non-levitical priests if they had such, and be without priests entirely. And should they have even procured *levitical* priests, *they* could not legally sacrifice in Samaria. Hence the Samaritans could satisfy their religious longings in no other way than by taking part in the Jewish worship at Jerusalem, which they did accordingly. This will account for their request made to the returned exiles to have a share in rebuilding the temple. But their request was refused, and they were left in their former state. They were without priests and without an established worship. Why then did they not erect an altar and choose priests from among themselves? Was it because they had *not* the book of the law? It was rather because *they had* it, and because by it they were forbidden to take a priest from among themselves. When Manasseh passed over to them, all was right. They obtained a regular Levitical priest, and worshipped in a new temple on Gerizim.*

According to the view now given, it does not follow from the arrival of Manasseh among them, that they got a copy of the law for the first time from his hands. They seem to have had it already.

As no argument coming from the advocates of the very late introduction of the law among the Samaritans against our present view, appears to us valid, neither is any urged by the adherents of its existence among the ten tribes and the remnant *at all times*, of weight in opposition to it. It is of no avail to affirm that the Pentateuch is *the only canonical book* of the Samaritans, and that no other part of the Old Testament had been written at the time they received it, else their canon would have had it also. As if they could not and would not

* Herbst, Einleit. vol. i. pp. 101, 102.

reject books containing matter objectionable to them. There was too much anti-Israelitish in the postmosaic writings to warrant their reception. We know what Steudel* and Stuart† advance against this, viz., that the Samaritans might very well receive the books of Joshua and Judges, which do not favour the preëminence of Jerusalem and the worship established there, but are quite unobjectionable. As if "the advantage the Samaritans would have gained by the reception of these two books, would have been counterbalanced by a far greater disadvantage. Had the Samaritans added the books of Joshua and Judges to their canon, it would have too plainly shewn that their protest against the remaining books proceeded merely from the feeling of self-interest. But the case would be different if they retained alone the work of the great lawgiver (to which even the Jews assigned the preëminence above all their later books), and rejected the rest as not invested with sufficient divine legitimation. . . . . Let it also be urged in addition, that the Samaritans could not feel satisfied if those writings contained nothing which spoke directly against them. Their patriotic legends took their rise probably not just at the time of the separation of the two kingdoms; they began as early as Joshua. Now, by the reception of the two books just mentioned, they would have narrowed the scope for their falsehoods. They could then no longer have maintained anything else for which they could not have brought proof from that quarter."‡

It is unnecessary at the present day to do more than allude to the opinion of Ussher respecting the origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, as it never obtained currency. This celebrated

* Einige Zweifel gegen die Annahme, es könne aus dem Samarit. Pentateuch kein Beweis, u. s. w. in Bengel's Archiv. iii. 626, et seq.

† American Biblical Repository for 1832, p. 707.

‡ Hengstenberg, Dissertations on the genuineness of the Pentateuch, translated by Ryland, vol. i. pp. 103, 104.

scholar thought, that a Samaritan impostor called Dositheus, made it out of the Hebrew and the Septuagint, by adding to, taking from, and changing the text at pleasure.* The hypothesis in question is too absurd to be entertained for a moment. Walton easily refuted it.† The Samaritan Pentateuch was mentioned by Eusebius, Cyril of Alexandria, Procopius of Gaza, Diodore, Jerome, the Greek scholiast, and others. After it had lain buried in the darkness of silence for upwards of a thousand years, so that its very existence was questioned, a copy was brought from the east by the traveller Della Valle, at the instigation of De Sancy, French ambassador at Constantinople. The latter sent it to the library of the Oratoire in Paris, and John Morin published it entire in the Paris Polyglott, having previously given some account of it in the preface to an edition of the Septuagint published at Paris in 1628. Not long after, Ussher procured six copies from the east, five of which it is thought are still in England; but the sixth, which he sent to De Dieu, has disappeared. Fabricius de Peirese also procured three copies from the east, which he sent to Morrin, for he had been solicited by the latter to procure the Samaritan Bible from the east, though he had already failed to receive the copy purchased in Egypt, in consequence of the ship in which it was having been plundered by pirates. Having been printed in the fifth volume of the Paris Polyglott, it was inserted by Walton in the London Polyglott, after the text had been collated with three of Ussher's MSS. The only separate edition is that of Blayney, published at Oxford in 1790 but in the Hebrew character.

A close resemblance between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint has always been noticed. It agrees in more than 2000 readings with the Alexandrine version, where it

* Epistola ad Ludovicum Cappellum, in Dublin edition of complete works, vol. vii. p. 604, et seq.

† Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta, ed. Dathe, p. 531, et seq.

differs from the Masoretic text. To account for such agreement, it has been conjectured by Bertholdt, Steudel, and others, that both flowed from a recension of the text handed down from earlier times. But there are circumstances adverse to this supposition. The Alexandrine-Jewish style of thinking was freer and more speculative than the Palestinian and Babylonian. And although it did not take liberties with the original text, partly because the Alexandrine Jews were mostly unacquainted with Hebrew, and partly because they looked up to their Palestinian brethren in regard to the original, and largely depended on their views, yet it found scope for its propensity in translations and marginal remarks. Now it is unquestionable, that the Alexandrine version manifests throughout the Jewish-Alexandrine style of thinking. There is a tendency in it to expand and make easier the readings of the Masoretic text, while it leans to the marginal conjectures of the Masoretic copies called *K'ri*. In like manner, the Samaritan Pentateuch has many *K'ris* in the text; and indulges in explanatory readings. With a want of critical skill the Samaritan scribes admitted freely into the text what the Alexandrine Jews had not ventured to receive, but had merely inserted in translations, or in the margin of the original. They took mere conjectural emendations, and deteriorated the text by their means. Incapable of producing what was original themselves, they received what was presented to them.

From a general survey of the Samaritan text we learn,—

First, that it exhibits readings not found in the Jewish text, but arbitrarily adopted for the purpose of rendering it complete and more perspicuous, of bringing expressions in the original into harmony with their religious ideas, or of adapting the orthography and construction of the Hebrew text to the Samaritan idiom.

It exhibits, *secondly*, readings which are mere accidental mistakes; and

Thirdly, it contains such as were neither designed nor accidental, but found in the copies from which the text at first flowed.

What the number of the latter is, it would be hazardous to affirm. They alone are available in shewing what the state of the Hebrew text was before the close of the canon. But whatever be their number, whether it be more than half of the entire variations, as Herbst affirms,* or much less, as is more probable, the readings in question, ancient though they be, want the marks of originality. With a few exceptions, they are not authentic.

Before proceeding farther with the history, we must now mark the time when the canon was completed, as the first division of the history terminates with that important event.

It is impossible to ascertain precisely the time when the canon was completed. Authentic history does not clearly indicate this important epoch in sacred literature. But by taking into account a variety of circumstances, we can arrive with much probability at a period *within* which the collection of the Old Testament writings was completed. It is a reasonable idea, that when Ezra and Nehemiah attempted with praiseworthy zeal to restore the religion and worship of their fathers, they did not neglect the sacred books composed before and during their time. The accounts contained in Ezra and Nehemiah, and the traditions of the Jews themselves, favour the opinion that the remains of the national literature were then collected as fully as possible, and put into as good a state as circumstances allowed. Nor is the historical basis of the view that Ezra bore a leading part in collecting and revising the sacred books, shaken by the fabulous circumstances associated with it in the writings of the early fathers, in passages of the Talmud, and in later Jewish authors. But though Ezra and Nehemiah paid special attention to the sacred books, collecting and revising them with care, it does not follow that the

* Einleitung, vol. i. p. 108.

canon was *closed* at that time. The collection was begun and carried forward up to their day, but all the books were not in it. The canon of the whole Hebrew Bible was not closed so early. Hengstenberg* indeed, and after him Hävernick,† contend that the canon was begun and completed under Ezra, Nehemiah, and the great synagogue; but that view is by no means universal. It is based on the Talmud and Josephus, chiefly the latter, whose testimonies have been minutely examined for the purpose of shewing that the canon was closed at the time mentioned. But there are difficulties in the way of its reception which they have not fairly met, even though it be allowed them that Malachi lived in the reign of Artaxerxes, contemporary with Nehemiah. Thus the Jewish tradition in *Baba Bathra*‡ says, that the men of the great synagogue *wrote out* (כָּתְבוּ) the twelve minor prophets. Now Bertholdt and Hävernick assign to the word *wrote* the sense of *bringing into the canon, adscription*, for which the latter refers to the preceding context. But the context clearly contradicts that sense, for it speaks of Joshua *writing* eight verses in the *law*. Does that mean, *to bring those eight verses into the sacred canon?* Besides, the explanation of Rashi proceeds on the assumption of the verb signifying *copied out*. Buxtorf translates the word accurately by *descripserunt*. The tradition too, as it occurs in its oldest form in *Pirke Aboth*,§ says nothing about collecting the Old Testament books into one volume. It speaks merely of the authors of separate books.‖

But a passage in Josephus is more relied on, though the language is somewhat ambiguous in one part. Since Hengstenberg and Hävernick referred to it in connection with the present subject, it has also received great attention from Prof. Stuart. We cannot see however that he has thrown better

* Beiträge zur Einleit. ins alte Testament, vol. i. p. 237, et seq.

† Einleitung, vol. 1. p. 139, et seq. ‡ Fol. 14, c. 2, fol. 15, c 1.

§ Cap. 1. ‖ See Buxtorf's Tiberias, p. 88, et seq. ed. 1665.

light on it than his predecessors. What the Jewish historian states, is, according to Mr. Stuart, "that the sacred books were completed in the reign of Artaxerxes."* Hence the conclusion is deduced, that as Artaxerxes Longimanus died 424 B.C., no part of the Hebrew canon can be later than that, if the testimony of Josephus is well grounded.

We cannot but think that the interpretations assigned to the very difficult words of Josephus by Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Stuart, &c., are somewhat precarious. We doubt whether they do not extract more from the passage than what the historian himself fairly intended.

If Josephus, as is affirmed, asserts that the sacred books were completed in the reign of Artaxerxes, and if this were the general settled opinion of the whole Jewish nation, how comes it that another view prevailed among the later Jews respecting the close of the canon? Either Jewish tradition is contradictory, or Josephus is giving his own judgment. How does it happen that Simon the Just, the last of the great synagogue, is reported in Jewish tradition to have closed the sacred canon? It is not found in any of the early Jewish traditions that the canon closed with Ezra, Nehemiah, Malachi apart from the simultaneous mention of the great synagogue. The Talmud does not assign it to Malachi the last of the prophets, or to the reign of Artaxerxes. The men of the great synagogue are always mentioned when the canon closed. The language is indefinite, not specific. It will not fairly bear the interpretation that the canon was finally closed till the men of the great synagogue had all died.

Still farther, it would appear from Nehem. xii. 22 and 10, 1 Chron. iii. 19-24, Esther ix. 19, that some books are later than the time allowed by Josephus. We know the assumptions which have been made to reduce these writings

* Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon, p. 226, American edition.

to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah; what interpretations have been assigned to Esther ix. 19 for the same purpose; but they are forced and unnatural. It would be out of place to do more at present than briefly indicate our opinion. Lengthened discussion must be avoided.

The important work begun by Ezra and Nehemiah was continued after them by the most competent authority, till the entire collection was declared complete, about 200 B.C. Those eminent reformers provided for the continuance of the work after them, till it should be finished. The later Jews affirm that this was done by Simon the Just, who died 292 B.C. according to the chronology of Eusebius, but 202 B.C. according to the best Jewish account, which is more correct;* and the prologue of Jesus the son of Sirach shews that a much later period cannot well be assigned. "The notices on this subject," says Jahn, "are so recent that they cannot be relied on as historical evidence; but as such traditions are generally founded on some truth, it is very probable that Simon did complete the collection and revision of the sacred books, and even add some things respecting events of more recent occurrence."† Hence we discard the opinion that the canon was completed in the days of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Malachi; though it has found such able advocates as Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and Stuart in recent times. The fact which has never yet been disproved, that books were received into the Jewish canon after Malachi and Artaxerxes, weakens Josephus' testimony. Arbitrary hypotheses, it is true, may assign some books to an earlier period, for the purpose of including them within the *prophetic succession*, but they betray their weakness. Even Herbst‡ refuses assent to the view of Hengstenberg; his editor disagreeing.

* See Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vortraege, p. 36.

† History of the Hebrew Commonwealth, translated by Stowe, p. 91, English edition.

‡ Einleitung, vol. i. § 13, p. 44, et seq.

It has been affirmed by Kennicott* and others, that the books of the Old Testament were probably left perfect by Ezra, Nehemiah, and subsequent *prophets*. They were completely repaired after the injuries suffered during the captivity, and purged from such errors as might have been introduced by transcribers. But no valid argument can be given for this notion. It is favoured by Jewish fables regarding Ezra; but that is all the countenance it receives from history or reason. Whatever we may think of Ezra as a preacher and author, his inspiration and consequent infallibility in correcting and revising the sacred books written before and during his day, rest on another basis. That basis we cannot see. It is unreal and imaginary. So too with Nehemiah or Malachi. Nor can Simon be thought to have produced a perfect, correct, and genuine copy of the whole Hebrew Bible. All who had to do with the settlement of the canon, from Ezra and Nehemiah to the latest, endeavoured to make the text as correct as possible. Autographs and the best copies within reach were employed for this purpose. They wished to have as pure a revision as could be effected. They proceeded therefore in much the same way as a critical editor does. But they were not infallible. We are inclined therefore to think that the text of the books collected by Ezra and Nehemiah was not *perfect*. Neither was the text *perfectly* free from error at any subsequent time. The canon was not wholly free from error when it was closed. It has not been so at any time. Doubtless it was *substantially* correct. But *all the words* were not the same as those written by the authors of the respective books. A miracle were required for such a result; and a miracle was not wrought, as far as we can judge. The canonical books were in a tolerably good state about 300 years before Christ, but they might have been in a much better. When the canon

* Dissertation the Second on the state of the printed Hebrew Text, p. 307.

was closed, their text was generally free from material corruption; but it might have been much freer. This is all that can be affirmed with probability. Inclined as we are to go farther and say that an absolutely correct, genuine copy was furnished under the immediate direction and superintendence of heaven by the inspired Ezra, or by him along with Nehemiah, or by others after them, we dare not make the assertion in the absence of all evidence, against analogy and the strongest presumption.

CHAPTER VII.

HISTORY OF THE TEXT, FROM THE CLOSE OF THE CANON TILL THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

THE state of the Hebrew text at the time when the Alexandrine version was made cannot be definitely or accurately determined, because of the condition in which the version now exists. It is obvious to all who are in any degree acquainted with the history of that translation, that it is at present very corrupt. We only possess copies of the text of the κοινὴ in its deteriorated state, or copies of the Hexaplar text which was never fitted to present a true picture of the original Septuagint. Under existing circumstances, all that can be done is to take a certain text of the Seventy as approaching nearest to the original one, and from it to judge of the Hebrew text when it was first translated into Greek. Perhaps we shall not be far wrong if we take for this purpose the text which appears in the four leading editions of the Septuagint.

Here then, with all the variations of the Septuagint from the Hebrew that must be attributed to transcribers, there are many which can only be taken as *original.* The version before us had at first many deviations from the present Hebrew Masoretic text. Such various readings must be traced to two sources, either to the caprice, carelessness, or ignorance of the translators, or to the Hebrew copies from which the version was made. It is only the latter class that we have to do with

in a history of the text, because they alone are fitted to give a representation of its state. Such are omissions, additions, and variations which appear in other ancient versions made independently of the Septuagint, and not interpolated from it. Such too are the readings, which, though peculiar to the Septuagint, proceed from no assignable motive. When it is impossible to discover how or in what way they assist the text, we assign them to the Hebrew copies then existing.

In the case of Jeremiah, the deviations from the present Masoretic text are larger and more considerable than those in any other book. We find there numerous additions, omissions, and transpositions of entire chapters, as well as verses. These are very perplexing. It is doubtful whether they belong to the translator, or to the document before him. If, as we incline to think, they belong in part to the translator, and in part to the recension he followed, it is impossible at the present day to separate the respective portions, and assign them to their proper sources. It is also doubtful how the case stands in the first part of Daniel; where it would be equally presumptuous at once to attribute the numerous deviations either to the translator himself, or to the Hebrew text he followed. In the case of 1 and 2 Samuel, there are also numerous departures from the Masoretic text; but none of equal extent or magnitude with those occurring in Jeremiah. Here we should have little hesitation in saying, that they chiefly belong to the translator, who had before him a text not widely different from the Masoretic one, and far superior to it, as Thenius thinks. It was *substantially* the same as the Masoretic. But until the true original text of the Septuagint itself be restored, or at least far more nearly restored than we have it at present—till its interpolations and corruptions be removed—we cannot with much advantage or safety judge of *the Hebrew text* which the translators followed. That the latter did differ in many places from the present Hebrew can-

not be doubted for a moment. That some of these departures too are important, can hardly be questioned. Yet it must not be thought, that *the greater number* of variations between the Septuagint and Masoretic Hebrew, as they now appear, owe their origin to Hebrew MSS. used by the translators. They are of later origin. Thus much concerning the state of the text from B.C. 280, till about 100 B.C.

From the completion of the Septuagint version till the destruction of Jerusalem and the downfall of the Jewish state, we know nothing of the Hebrew text. There is no existing memorial belonging to that time which enables us to judge of its condition.

Nothing can be learned of the state of the Hebrew text from Philo, since he used the Septuagint alone. He did not know the original text, and had no idea of its being widely different from the Greek version. In his time the study of Hebrew at Alexandria had been laid aside.*

The text from which the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan were made did not differ much from the present Masoretic text. The deviations are not important or numerous.

* See Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta, p. 45, et seq.

CHAPTER VIII.

HISTORY OF THE TEXT, FROM THE DOWNFALL OF THE JEWISH STATE TILL THE FINAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MASORETIC TEXT.

AFTER the destruction of the Jewish power, we have the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the old Syriac, Josephus. Of all these it may be said, that while they deviate more or less from the present Hebrew, they are much nearer to it than the Septuagint. Aquila and the other Greek translators, though departing from the Masoretic text, do not by any means disagree with it to the extent of the Seventy. Josephus appears to have generally used the Septuagint, even where it departed from the text now called Masoretic. Though he employed the latter, yet it was in such a way that it is impossible to discover from his Antiquities in what condition it was.

The text lying at the basis of the Peshito or old Syriac version, is *substantially* the Masoretic one. Yet there are many departures from it. Not a few readings better than the present Hebrew text exhibits are sanctioned by the Syriac. In many cases it approaches the text of the Septuagint. The Greek version had an influence upon it.

Is it true then, that the text lying at the basis of the two oldest documents, viz., the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint version, is more corrupt than that from which the versions made soon after Christ were derived? The question

must be answered in the affirmative. The younger text is much nearer the original form of it than the older one represented by the two documents. What then is the cause of this? Was a revision undertaken by the learned Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem? Did they conceive the idea of comparing MSS., revising the entire text, and purifying it from such corruptions as appeared in the Samaritan and the Septuagint? We know that there were schools of learning in which not only a knowledge of the law, but grammar and criticism were prosecuted, in Jabne, Ziphoria, Lydda, Caesarea, Tiberias, and somewhat later in Babylonia. Did such a revision proceed from some or all of them? The idea cannot be entertained for various reasons; chiefly because obvious and glaring errors, such as the Masoretic text exhibits, would not have been left. Certain phenomena would have disappeared beneath their critical hands, else they must have shewn an arbitrary caprice and carelessness in regard to their holy writings, which their known history belies. They could never have left the books of Chronicles in their present state, nor the books of Samuel and Kings, nor even the Pentateuch. The purer state of the copies, from which the early versions subsequent to Christ's appearance were made, was mainly owing to the country they belonged to. They were Palestinian copies. They had been in the hands of priests and learned men for the most part —of persons who venerated their national literature, and guarded the text with scrupulous care from innovation. The use made of a part of their sacred books in the temple-service also contributed to keep them free from errors. Such Palestinian copies are the source of the Masoretic text; and from them flowed the versions of Aquila and the other Greek translators, those of Onkelos and Jonathan, and the Syriac version besides. As to the MSS. lying at the basis of the Seventy and Samaritan Pentateuch, they were in the hands of Jews who did not reside in Palestine. Their possessors and tran-

scribers belonged, for the most part, to Alexandria, or had been affected by the Alexandrine theology. In the progress of time there arose from these copies a text such as that which forms the basis of the two documents in question—a text with additions and explanatory glosses, betraying less care in regard to the letter of the sacred writings. The freer influences amid which the persons in whose hands those MSS. were lived and moved, led to innovations upon the text, which the stricter Palestinian Jews would never have thought of.

The Jewish state had been broken up. The once favoured people of God were deprived of their freedom. Their temple was destroyed. But they had still their sacred national writings—the only inheritance saved from the general wreck of their fortunes. Thenceforward it became the leading object of their learned men to attend to the Scriptures. The greater the difficulties which stood in their way, the more desirous were they to study the letter. Every word, letter, and sentence was holy in their eye. Every prevailing tendency of mind among them was favourable to the integrity of the text. Whether they were superstitiously observant of the letter, as though the rigid observance of it satisfied the demands of the divine law; or whether they considered the mere text as an envelope, containing beneath it mystery and recondite truth, the effect was the same in regard to the careful preservation of the records. Rabbins and Cabbalists were equally alive to the importance of having the usual number of verses, words, and letters; examined all deviations from it, so that extraneous matter might be removed; and laid down prescriptions for maintaining the integrity of the text. In this manner, the learned as well as the unlearned mind of the people united in the same desire and contributed to the same work.

In the Hebrew column of Origen's Hexapla, we find a text allied to the Masoretic. This was in the third century. In the fourth Jerome employed Jewish teachers belonging to

Palestine and MSS. of the same country, in his Latin version, from the Hebrew original. On this account the text is very nearly conformable to the recension we now possess.

From the second century and onward an increasing number of writers busied themselves with oral explanations of the *Torah* or law of Moses, and the systematic collection of them afterwards called *Mishna*, δευτέρωσις, from שָׁנָה.

Fearing that the oral law which they held so sacred should be lost or impaired, the Jews during the second century thought of committing it to writing. It is supposed that Rabbi Judah († 191), surnamed *the holy*, made the permanent record of it. He is said to have lived under Antoninus Pius. It is disputed, however, whether he *actually wrote out* the Mishna *for the first time* and *fully*. There is no doubt that he was the compiler and *editor* of it, so to speak; that is, he continued the process of sifting and arranging the materials of the Halacha, from all oral and written sources, after the method of Rabbi Meir, and the example of Rabbi Simeon his father. He *completed* the work at the time. But the Mishna of Rabbi Judah is not exactly that which has come down to us; since his disciples had to do with it.*

A twofold commentary or series of commentaries was subsequently appended to it—one called the Babylonian *Gemara; Aram.* גמר to *learn;* the other the Jerusalem *Gemara.* The former was begun by Rabbi Asche († 427), and was completed by Rabbi Jose, president of the Academy at Syra, who died A.D. 475. These portions, committed to writing after the Mishna, constitute *notes* on that text; and make up, together with it, the *Babylonian Talmud*, תלמוד from למד. The Gemara of the Jerusalem Talmud proceeded from the Academy at Tiberias, and embodied the notes of the Palestinian Jews. It is said to have been written chiefly towards the close of the

* See Steinschneider, in Ersch and Gruber's Encyklopaedie, § ii. part 27, p. 366.

fourth century, about 370-380 A.D. It is often incorrectly attributed to Rabbi Jochanan, who died in 279. This Gemara, with the same Mishna as before, makes up *the Jerusalem Talmud.*

The Talmud bears various evidence of critical attention to the text of the canonical books. In it are contained precepts relating to biblical calligraphy. Transcribers were to observe certain rules in copying the Old Testament, especially the Law.

It also mentions comparison of MSS.; and a preference is given to that reading which the majority present.

The numbering of verses, words, and letters, seems to have been an early practice. Separate books and sections were thus counted. The sum total was marked at the end; and the middle letter and verse faithfully given. However laborious and trifling such a task was, it had a good effect on the purity of the text.

But the most important feature of the Talmud is certain kinds or classes of critical corrections, which also appear in the Masora, and in the commentaries of later Jewish authors. These are—

1. עִטּוּר סוֹפְרִים, *Ittur sopherim, ablatio scribarum*, concerning the removal of the prefix *vau*, erroneously prefixed to words in five passages, viz., Gen. xviii. 5; xxiv. 55; Numb. xxxi. 2; Psalm lxviii. 26; xxxvi. 7.

2. *Puncta extraordinaria.*—Fifteen words have one or more such points, as אֲשֶׁר, Numb. xxi. 30; לוּלֵא, Psalm xxvii. 13; בְּקוּמָהּ, Gen. xix. 33. The Talmud mentions but six of these words; the Masora fifteen—ten in the Law, four in the Prophets, and one in the Hagiographa, viz. in Gen. xvi. 5, xviii. 9, xix. 33, xxxiii. 4, xxxvii. 12; Numb. iii. 39, ix. 10; xxi. 30; xxix. 15, 29; 2 Sam. xix. 19; Isaiah xliv. 9; Ezek. xlvi. 22; Psalm xxvii. 13.* It is probable that such

* See Buxtorf's Tiberias, cap. xvii. p. 162, ed. 1665; and Cappelli Critica Sacra, vol. i. p. 455, et seq.

points over words and letters were intended to mark their suspicious or spurious character. Gesenius found that they had the same import in Samaritan MSS.

3. קְרִי וְלֹא כְתִיב, *K'ri v'lo c'thib*, words which did not stand in the text, and yet should be written there. The Talmud enumerates seven places of this kind, viz. Ruth ii. 3, iii. 5, 17; 2 Sam. viii. 3, xvi. 23; Jerem. xxxi. 38, l. 29. Elias Levita mentions eight; and in the preface of the same work (*Masoreth Hammasoreth*) ten. Here *the Masora* puts the vowels in the text, and the consonants in the margin; the circle in the empty space merely referring to the margin.

4. כְּתִיב וְלֹא קְרִי, *c'thib v'lo K'ri*, words which did stand in the text, but yet should not be read. The Talmud mentions five words of this kind, viz., אִם in four places, Ruth iii. 12; 2 Sam. xiii. 33, xv. 21; Jerem. xxxix. 12. נא in 2 Kings v. 18. את in Jerem. xxxviii. 16. ידרך in Jerem. li. 3; and חמש in Ezek. xlviii. 16.* These also are exegetical glosses. The Masorah does not punctuate the words.

5. The Talmud likewise mentions different readings which the Masoretes call קְרִי וּכְתוּב, *K'ri ūc'thib*, for example, at Job xiii. 15; Haggai i. 8. Here two readings of the one passage were known to the Talmudists, and they were in doubt about the preferable one.

The nature of these corrections has been variously judged of. Eichhorn and Bertholdt regard them as the *results of critical revisions* or *a critical revision* of the Hebrew text. Herbst objects to this opinion, because it is unlikely that the collation of MSS. instituted by the Talmudists could have discovered no more real or supposed mistakes; and that the readings regarded as authentic should not have been taken into the text.† But these considerations are of little weight. The Talmudists must not be judged of by modern notions. Let us reflect on their superstitious venera-

* See Cappell, Crit. Sac. vol. i. p. 186, et seq.

† Einleitung, vol. i. p. 115.

tion for whatever they found already written in their MSS.; their reluctance to erase either a word or a letter; and we need not be surprised at the small amount of correction which they noted and recommended. But indeed it is a false view of the subject, if it be thought that the Talmudists undertook a *formal* or an *extensive* collation of MSS. They did not engage in a great critical work, for the purpose among other things of obtaining a pure text. Here Bertholdt is in error. Before the Talmud, critics had noted various readings. And at the time of the Talmud, more were doubtless observed. In consequence of these various readings, the Talmudists marked such as struck their attention, with the view of introducing better readings into the text. They thought they saw in various places what was the authentic reading, where it had been expelled or obscured. That they did not make more corrections, must have been owing to various causes, such as, the substantial agreement of the MSS. they had, their fear of innovation or alteration in what was written, and their attention to *exegetical* more than to *critical* studies. Still, we doubt not that the corrections enumerated are the traces of revision. They are the results of *some* critical skill applied to the text. They show that learned men, even before the Talmud, had looked at the text in various parts with care; and came to the conclusion that it was not absolutely faultless. If these observations be correct, it follows, that Herbst is wrong in thinking that they are indications of a hidden sense, rather than the evidences of critical revision. It is vain to quote Jerome when he writes respecting the extraordinary point over בְּקוּמָהּ, in Genesis xix. 33, "Appungunt desuper quasi incredibile et quod rerum natura non capiat, coire quenpiam nescientem," and the words of the Tract. Nasir, "Quare est punctatum supra literam ו in וּבְקוּמָהּ de primogenita? Ad indicandum quod, cum decumberet, non cognoverit, et dum surgeret, noverit."* Such explanation must be attributed to misconception.

* Fol. 23, c. 1.

Unusual letters are also mentioned in the Talmud, *literae majusculae*, *minusculae*, *suspensae*, *inversae*, i.e, letters larger or smaller than the text, or above the line, or inverted. See Psalm lxxx. 16; Gen. ii. 4; Psalm lxxx. 14; Numb. x. 35; Some *literae majusculae* point out the middle letter of a book, as גחון, Levit. xi. 42. Hence De Wette supposes that these letters may have originally had a critical significance. This however is doubtful.* It seems improbable that old variations or critical remarks should lie in these forms. Gesenius affirms† that he could not discover this in them. Perhaps some of them originated in the mistakes of transcribers, others in the fertile fancy of the cabbalistic writers attributing a mysterious meaning to them. But a *concealed sense* was *afterwards* sought in all.

Euphemistic K'ris, *i.e.*, *voces honestiores* for textual words looked upon as unseemly or immodest, are also mentioned in the Talmud, ex. gr. in Deut. xxviii. 30.

After the completion of the Talmud, the learned Jews, especially those at Tiberias where there was a celebrated academy, cultivated Hebrew literature with renewed zeal. They studied the text of the Bible critically, in *all* its peculiarities—a thing which had not been done before. MSS. were compared, points only touched before were investigated, miscellaneous observations were arranged, and what had been *loosely* connected as one whole, was systematised. The letters themselves were no longer the exclusive subject of examination, but the vowels and accents also. In short, these scholars enlarged the observations of their predecessors the Talmudists, carried forward what they had begun, and made many additions to existing materials of criticism. Their remarks were numerous, being *grammatical*, *exegetical*, and *philological*. They were first transmitted by oral tradition, and afterwards written down. Hence the name *Masorah*, מָסוֹרָה, *tradition*,

* Einleitung, sixth edition, pp. 135, 136. † Lehrgebäude, p. 11.

was applied to the collection, and *Masoretes*, בַּעֲלֵי מָסוֹרָה to the persons engaged in it. The greater part of it concerns *the text*, prescribing means by which it may be kept free from change and corruption.

Some of the older Jews, such as Elias Levita, Kimchi, &c. refer the Masorah to Moses as its author. But the common opinion of the Jews, and of such Christian writers as Buxtorf, Bartolocci, Leusden, Pfeiffer, Loescher, Carpzov, Wolf, &c. traces the commencement of it to Ezra and the great synagogue. Both views have been justly exploded. Part of it is older than the Talmud. After the composition of the latter work, the remarks increased from century to century, till at the commencement of the sixth century, the scattered observations were collected and put together by the Jews at Tiberias. Such was *the beginning* of what is now called *the written Masorah*. From time to time new remarks were appended, or new examples added to the old, so that the Masoretes were properly a succession of learned men from the commencement of the sixth down to perhaps the eleventh century. We say *perhaps*, for both the beginning and end of the work can only be fixed arbitrarily, agreeably to the opinion of Elias Levita, who says, "Auctores Masorae innumeros fuisse, sibique una generatione post aliam successisse annis compluribus, neque cognitum nobis esse tempus principii vel finis ipsorum."* Aaron Ben Asher and Jacob Ben Naphtali may be considered as closing the series. With them the Masorah may be said to terminate.

From the successive formation of the Masorah, it will appear that some parts of it are much more recent than others. But they cannot now be separated. The *old* Masorah of the sixth century, and the *new* Masorah *after* the sixth, cannot be clearly distinguished, however desirable the thing might be.

The various remarks of which the collection consists, were at first written in separate books or leaves without suitable

* Praefat. 3 in *Massoreth Hammasoreth*.

order or arrangement. This immense mass of observations was contained in separate MSS. which are now very rare. Jacob Ben Chayim, however, had several of them when he superintended Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible. Buxtorf says, that in his time, there was one in the Palatine library at Rome; and Bruns had another. But it was found laborious and inconvenient to make use of the entire work. Resembling a huge chaos, it deterred even bold-hearted readers, or perplexed such as *had* the patience to turn it over in the perusal of the Bible. Accordingly extracts were made, embracing the most necessary portions, which were transferred to the margin of the Old Testament MSS. The mode however in which they were made was most inconvenient. The remarks were not distributed each one in the place to which it belonged, but those of one kind were put together in one place of the Bible, leaving it to the memory of the reader to recollect each single observation at the passage to which it referred. And as the work was not completed at once, but was carried forward by degrees; later writers enlarging the remarks of their predecessors by additional ones, often put them into a different place, without regard to the antecedent annotators. When they did not write in a separate book, but in the margin of Biblical MSS., the later and earlier notes, though belonging to the same passage or point, were sometimes widely separated. This compendium or epitome is called *Masorah parva.* It is couched in abbreviated, obscure, technical words, which it is very difficult to decipher. The position of it is usually at the side of the text, as in Buxtorf's Bible, between the Hebrew text and Chaldee paraphrase.

After the compendium had been made, they began to put the Masorah itself in the margin of the Biblical MSS. Perhaps the chief cause of this was the great obscurity of *the little Masorah*, filled as it is with countless abbreviations. But in placing the whole work in the margin of MSS., great careless-

ness was evinced. The remarks were not always placed over against the verse to which they belonged. And then they omitted portions, which the margin, as was often the case, could not hold. They wrote what filled the margin, transferring the remainder to the end of the book, but not always. Or, on the other hand, if the Masorah did not fill the margin of a page, they repeated as much of the preceding part as filled up the gap, or inserted patches from other places. It was also customary, for the sake of ornament, to make it up into all kinds of figures. Oxen, fishes, birds, men, flowers, &c. were fashioned out of it. And when the copyist had too much or too little of the Masorah for his complete figure, he did not hesitate to abridge, add, or repeat, in order that he might have just what sufficed. Hence we can account for the disorderly, confused, erroneous state in which the Masorah was before Jacob Ben Chayim undertook to reduce it to something like order. The *Masorah magna*, comprehending the entire critical apparatus, is commonly placed above and below the Hebrew text, as in Buxtorf's Rabbinical Bible. Hence it is sometimes called textual, *textualis.* What is called the final Masorah, *Masora finalis*, and sometimes *maxima*, is properly a part of the great Masorah, from which it should not have been separated. It is placed at the end of the Old Testament books, and forms a sort of concordance, disposing the words on which the Masoretes made remarks, in alphabetical order. It supplies things which could not conveniently find a place in the *Masora magna.* But the two should not have been separated—the mutual references of the one to the other being most inconvenient in use.

I. To the class of *corrections*, which is by far the most important part of the Masorah, belong those observations called by the word *K'ri* קְרִי, *read.* These indicate that something in the text or כְּתִיב, *written*, is wrong or anomalous and must

be corrected in the way specified. The textual reading or *c'thib* is so intimately connected with the marginal reading or *K'ri*, that the vowels of the former must be read with the consonants of the latter.

K'ris may be divided into various kinds, such as *critical*, *grammatical*, *orthographical*, *exegetical*, *euphemistical*.

The *critical* refer to *transposition of consonants*, as in 1 Kings vii. 45, *c'thib* האהל, *K'ri* האלה; 2 Sam. xv. 28, *c'thib* בעברות, *K'ri* בערבות; to *interchange of consonants*, as in 1 Kings xii. 33, *c'thib* מלבד, *K'ri* מלבו; Ezekiel xxv. 7, *c'thib* לבג, *K'ri* לבז; *to the restoration or removal of consonants*, as in Amos viii. 8, *c'thib* נשקה, *K'ri* נשקעה; 2 Kings ix. 15, *c'thib* לגיד, *K'ri* להגיד; Joshua viii. 12, *c'thib* לעיר, *K'ri* לעי; *to a different division of words*, as in Psalm lv. 16, *c'thib* ישימות, *K'ri* ישי מות; Job xxxviii. 12, *c'thib* ידעת השחר, *K'ri* ידעת השחר; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6, *c'thib* בחר בתיהם, *K'ri* בחרבתיהם.

Grammatical K'ris are such as *c'thib* הוא, *K'ri* היא, which occurs very frequently in the Pentateuch; Gen. xxiv. 14, 16, 28, 55, 57, &c. *c'thib* נער, *K'ri* נערה. Jerem. xlii. 6, *c'thib* אנו, *K'ri* אנחנו.

Orthographical K'ris are such as 2 Chron. viii. 18, *c'thib* איניות, *K'ri* אניות; Ezek. xxvii. 15, *c'thib* והובנים, *K'ri* והבנים.

Exegetical K'ris are found in Psalm c. 3, cxxxix. 16; Isaiah ix. 2, *c'thib* לא, *K'ri* לו.

Akin to these are glosses, such as Prov. xx. 20, *c'thib* באישון חשך, *K'ri* באשון חשך.

Euphemistical K'ris are exemplified in Deut. xxviii. 30, *c'thib* ישגלנה *K'ri* ישכבנה.

The most frequent example of a *K'ri* is the word יהוה, which was forbidden to be uttered by any except the high priest, and by him but once a year in the Holy of Holies. On all other occasions, it was to be read אֲדֹנָי *Lord*, whose points it has, except where it is immediately preceded or followed by the word אֲדֹנָי itself.

There is no Hebrew MS. or edition which presents a complete list of all existing *K'ris*. Both the number and position of the *K'ris* and *c'thibs* vary. One MS. has more, another fewer of them. Thus Elias Levita reckons them 848. According to Cappellus there are in the second edition, printed at Venice by Bomberg, 1171; in the Plantin Bible 793; in the Antwerp 983. In one MS. the marginal reading is in the text, the *c'thib* in the margin; in another the reverse is the case. Not unfrequently too, the vowels of the *c'thib* refer to a *K'ri* which has disappeared from the margin.

The divided opinions of former scholars as to *the source* of these marginal corrections have ceased to attract much notice. It is commonly admitted at the present day, that the party who maintained they were derived from tradition and the comparison of MSS., as well as the party who ascribed them to the judgment of the Masoretes themselves, were equally at fault in their conclusions. The real source was neither the one nor the other *exclusively*. The *K'ris* resulted from tradition and comparison of MSS., *in addition to* the mind and judgment of the Masoretes themselves. In every case they were considered preferable to the textual readings by the Masoretes; and the later Jews have followed them. But Christian critics should not, and do not usually, adopt the *K'ris* or the *c'thibs* absolutely. They condemn neither the one nor the other entirely. It is safest to follow them according to the evidence in each individual passage. The *K'ris* should not be taken as the true readings *in all cases*. *Much less* should the *c'thibs*.

In the Masorah is also mentioned תִּיקּוּן סוֹפְרִים, *Tikkun Sopherim*, *correctio scribarum*, passages whence interpolated orthographical mistakes were removed. These passages are sometimes given as sixteen, sometimes eighteen. They are Gen. xviii. 22; Numb. xi. 15; xii. 12; 1 Sam. iii. 13; 2 Sam. xvi. 12, xx. 1; Job vii. 20, xxxii. 3; Psalm cvi. 20; Hosea

iv. 7; Jerem. ii. 11; Lament. iii. 20; Ezek. viii. 17; Habak. i. 12; Zech. ii. 12; Malachi i. 13. The other two are uncertain. Vogel gives five other examples.*

עִטּוּר סוֹפְרִים *Ittur Sopherim*, *ablatio scribarum*, the same as in the Talmud.

The passages are the same in the Masorah.

The *K'ri v'lo c'thib* already spoken of in the Talmud are mentioned in the Masorah, and in greater number, viz. thirteen; Judges xx. 13; Ruth iii. 5, 17; 2 Sam. viii. 3, xvi. 23, xviii. 20; 2 Kings xix. 31, 37; Jerem. xxxi. 38, l. 29; Joshua xxii. 34; 2 Kings xx. 13; Isaiah liii. 4, lv. 11; Psalm xcvi. 3. They differ however in different editions.

On the other hand, the *c'thib v'lo K'ri* are the same in the Masorah as in the Talmud.

Words furnished with the *extraordinary points* are fifteen. They are also mentioned in the Talmud, but not so many of them.

The *unusual letters* also mentioned in the Talmud are spoken of in the Masorah.

Of these, the first (*Tikkun Sopherim*) consists of corrections already made, rather than corrections to be made. But the *K'ri v'lo c'thib* and the *c'thib v'lo K'ri* are *exegetical* rather than *critical*. They are *glosses* shewing what *might* or *might not* be read, not various *readings*. They resemble therefore the *euphemistic* K'ris, which are *paraphrastic* explanations or equivalents of certain terms.

The Masoretes also attempted *conjectural* remarks in the case of difficult words. These are called סְבִירִין, *i.e.*, *thoughts*, *suppositions*, *conjectures*. Thus in Gen. xix. 23, on the words הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ יָצָא עַל הָאָרֶץ, it is observed, ג׳ סְבִירִין יָצְאָה *i.e.*, in three places it is supposed that it should be read יָצְאָה. The three are here, Jerem. xlviii. 45, Dan. viii. 9. In Exod. iv. 19, the words לֵךְ שֻׁב מִצְרַיִם are accompanied with this

* Ad Cappelli Crit. Sac. vol. i. pp. 454, 455.

remark, ה׳ סְבִירִין מִצְרַיְמָה, *i. e.*, it is thought that ה *local* should belong to the word מצרים. Such conjectures were suggested by grammatical grounds, because the analogy of the language was not strictly observed, where they were put forward.

It is scarcely correct to speak of *the Masoretic recension.* The phrase at least suggests a false idea. The Masoretes did not give a certain form to the text itself. They made the received text the basis of their critical remarks, giving in many instances their sentiments respecting parts of it. If the text were altered in every case where they recommend—if it were made conformable to their ideas of what it should be—it might then be proper to speak of the Masoretic recension. Had the remodelling recommended by the learned Jews been carried into execution, we might speak with accuracy of a *recension.* But though they *revised* the text, they did not make a *recension* of it. They left the text undisturbed, placing their emendation in the margin, when they came to a word which they thought erroneously written.

II. The other class of observations comprised in the Masorah refers to the existing state of the text. It contains remarks *on the text as it is*, not *corrections* of it. Instead of giving what *should be* in the text, the attention is directed to what *is* in it. Of course this is a less useful part of the Masorah than the former; and has less to do with our present subject.

To this class of observations belong various notices of grammatical, orthographical, and exegetical difficulties, as well as singularities. Thus they remark—

1. On certain peculiarities of particular verses, ex. gr. "there are two verses in the *Torah* which begin with ם; there are eleven verses in which the first and last letter is נ; there are forty verses in which לא is read three times," &c. &c.

2. They remark on the structure of words. In very many places they observe that such a verb is connected with such a noun; such a preposition is construed so and so, &c.; ex. gr. there are eight verses in which the noun חַטָּאָה is construed with the verb עָשָׂה; שָׁמַע is connected with לְקוֹל seventeen times; עָלָה is joined with אֶל הָאֱלֹהִים three times. The verb נִשְׁבַּע joined with בֵּאלֹהִים signifying *to swear by God*, occurs four times, 1 Sam. xxx. 15; Gen. xxi. 23; Joshua ii. 12; 1 Sam. xxiv. 21.

3. Remarks on the signification of words. Thus it is observed on the verb וַיָּגֶל, Gen. xxix. 10, that there are two verbs with a twofold signification. The one means "*and he rolled*," from the root גָּלַל. The other is וַיָּגֶל כְּבוֹדִי, "and my glory will rejoice," Psalm xvi. 9. Again, on the word עלה, Gen. vi. 11, it is remarked, that it occurs six times in the sense of *leaf*.

4. Grammatical remarks on the vowels, diacritic points, and accents. Thus at Gen. ix. 15, on לְמַבּוּל, it occurs nowhere else with sheva. At בַּיַּמִּים, Gen. i. 22, they remark, that three are dageshed. At Gen. xvi. 13, on רָאִי it is observed, that there is no other example of Resh with Chateph Kametz. At Gen. i. 5, on לָאוֹר it is remarked, that there are seven with Kametz.

5. Orthographical observations commonly refer to words written *fully* or *defectively*.

6. Enumerations of the verses, words, and letters in every book of the Bible; with the word or letter which is in the middle of each book. Thus it is remarked on Jeremiah, that the book consists of 1365 verses; and that ויאמר חנניה, xxviii. 11, is in the middle.

If now we look for what the Talmud and Masorah possess in common, we shall find that both mention the *Ittur Sopherim*, the *K'ri v'lo c'thib*, *the c'thib v'lo K'ri*, the *extraordinary points*, *the unusual letters*, *the numbering* of *the middle* letters, words, and verses in various books. Even various readings are mentioned

in two places of the Talmud, equivalent to *K'ris* in the Masorah, though not so called; while *euphemistic* K'ris appear, but not of course by such title.

The value of the Masorah has been depreciated or overrated according to the prejudices and opinions of critics. The ancient Jews called it "the hedge of the law," the preserver of the purity of the text; and seemed desirous to express the signification of the name by the position and form they gave to it, while they surrounded the text with it in all the curious shapes it is found to present.

This has always been the prevailing view of the Jews. Nor is it contradicted by the author of the book *Cosri*, as some have asserted. On the contrary, he affirms in answer to the question, "whether it were vain and superfluous, or a necessary and useful occupation," that it was a useful and necessary employment assisted by divine wisdom. It would be difficult to say who those wise men were, whom Ephodaeus, mentioned in Muscatus's commentary on Cosri, represents as traducing, despising, and vituperating the Masoretes. The same writer seems to have confounded Abenezra's own opinion with the opinion of others which he was giving, for all the probabilities are against Abenezra's speaking disparagingly of the Masoretes.* Besides, it should be considered that the unfavourable opinions entertained by Jews whose words are still on record, relate to the work as it was, not to it as it has suffered from time, carelessness, and injury. Both Elias Levita and Jacob Ben Chayim complain of the copies *they had*, into which errors and confusion had been introduced.

It must be allowed, that a great part of the Masorah is useless and trifling. A few portions are valuable. In it we meet with very ancient readings belonging perhaps to MSS. as old as the beginning of the Christian era. It assists us in judging of modern MSS. Indeed it is almost the only ancient

* See Wolfii Bibliotheca Hebraea, vol. ii. pp. 529, 530.

test which enables us to do so. Yet it did not purge the text from former mistakes; neither did it preserve it from subsequent corruption. It *contributed* to both; but it did not accomplish either. After all reasonable deductions and qualifications, we are disposed to regard the Masorah as a valuable and useful work—one that tended in no small measure to the genuineness and integrity of the Biblical text. Without it, the Old Testament Scriptures would have been in a much less satisfactory condition. We are grateful to these laborious Jews for the industry they employed upon the text; and only wish that they had proceeded in another method, and omitted trifling puerilities. The intrinsic merit of their work will always fail to be *fully* realised in consequence of the confusion pervading it. The mass has been thrown together so awkwardly; it has been printed so incorrectly, and deciphered so imperfectly that readers are deterred from it. The difficulty and perplexity inherent in it must ever prove formidable obstacles in the way of its perusal.

At the end of the second edition of Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible, Jacob Ben Chayim printed a collection of oriental and western readings, or in other words Babylonian and Palestinian. Little or nothing is known of the author or authors of this collection. Nor is the time when it was made well ascertained. Eichhorn supposes that the two flourishing academies at Babylon and Tiberias sent to each other as correct a transcript as possible of the text commonly received among the Jews they represented, and that this list contains the differences observed between them.* Such collation is usually assigned to the eighth century. With greater probability does the collection belong to the seventh century. It consists of from 216 to 220 readings, and is given by Walton in the sixth volume of the London Polyglott. These readings refer to the consonants alone, except

* Einleitung, vol. i. § 131, p. 368.

two relating to Mappik. Hence they are thought to be older than the introduction of the vowel system. They must be older than many of the Masoretic remarks. They relate to different points, chiefly to the *K'ri* and *c'thib*. Thus it is affirmed that the Orientals and Occidentals agree in a *c'thib*, but the former have a *K'ri*, the latter none; ex. gr., it is remarked by Norzi on Joshua viii. 13, that לעיר is both an eastern and western reading, the former without a *K'ri*, the latter with ק' לעי. Again, the western text has a *C'thib* without a *K'ri;* on the contrary, the eastern has a different *c'thib*, and the western *c'thib* as a *K'ri*. Thus at Joshua viii. 12, בית אל is in the western text without a *K'ri;* but the eastern has בית אור with the *K'ri* בית אל. Still farther, both texts have a *K'ri*, but that of the Oriental is the *c'thib* of the Occidental, and *vice versa*. Thus in Joshua xxiv. 8, the western *c'thib* אביאה, *K'ri* אביא; the eastern *c'thib* אביא, *K'ri* אביאה.

It is remarkable that none of these readings refers to the Pentateuch. Probably that part of the Bible had been more carefully copied than the rest.

In our common editions, the Oriental reading is generally printed. How this came to be is difficult to discover. Eichhorn conjectures, either that the Oriental text was preferred by the western Jews themselves, or that our editions of the Bible have accidentally flowed from MSS. which followed an eastern revision.*

If the collection be an authentic, unadulterated one, it shows the existence of a Babylonian as well as of a Palestinian Masorah. The intercourse between the Jews in the west and those in the east had stimulated the latter to learned studies, awakening a kindred spirit. But the fruits of the eastern researches that have reached us are too small to give a correct or comprehensive picture of the Babylonian Masoretes. The

* Einleitung, vol. i. § 131, p. 369.

list is insignificant, and the points to which it refers of small moment, such as the orthography and form of a word.

There is another list of various readings in the Rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf, and still better, in the sixth volume of the London Polyglott. It owes its origin to the labours of Aharon Ben Asher and Jacob Ben Naphtali, the former a Palestinian, the latter a Babylonian Jew; both belonging to the eleventh century. It is supposed that the one presided over the academy at Tiberias, the other over that of Babylon. These readings refer exclusively to the vowels and accents, with the single exception of Canticles viii. 6, where Ben Naphtali remarks on the word שׁלהבתיה that it ought to be divided into שַׁלְהֶבֶת יָהּ, *the fire of Jehovah.* It has been inferred from the nature of this collection, that the vowel system and accentuation of the Old Testament were completed before it was made. The vocalisation of the present day was established, and the unpointed MSS. had gone out of use. The western Jews usually favour the readings of Ben Asher; the eastern those of Ben Naphtali.

In this manner was the Hebrew text in the course of various successive centuries brought into a certain normal state called the *Masoretic* text. It was fixed about the eleventh century. Few alterations of importance were made in it afterwards. So great was the estimation in which it was held by the Jews, that it was reckoned the only correct one; and transcribed both for public and private use. The ancient copies were allowed to perish, and the Masoretic ones furnished with their vowels and accents came into general use. We regret the fate to which the old MSS. were consigned through neglect; but the inconvenience of reading them, unpointed and unaccented as they were, naturally led to their disuse. Perhaps the MSS. from this period and onward were made more and more conformable to the Masorah; though the existence of various Antemasoretic readings in MSS. shews

that *all* were not so altered. But though the ancient copies are now irrecoverably lost, there is no good reason for supposing that their preservation to the present time would have had an *essential* influence in altering the form of the text to any considerable degree. That they would have contributed to make it purer than it now is, there can be no doubt. They would have helped to remove several blemishes which stand in the Masoretic text, and guided to the original reading. But no *vital* change would have been effected by their means. The Masorah can hardly be said to have been printed for the first time in Bomberg's first Rabbinical Bible edited by Felix Pratensis. In the appendix at the end some pages appeared there after the manner of the *Masorah finalis*, but in great disorder, and with a corrupted text, for the editor himself did not understand the Masorah. But in Bomberg's second Rabbinical Bible, Jacob Ben Chayim set himself to cleanse the Augean stable. With immense labour he brought the mass into something like order, doing more than any other man for its purification and arrangement, that it might be of use to critics. When we consider the state in which he found it, it is surprising that he should have done so much in a most uninviting field. After him the elder Buxtorf did a good deal to rectify it. He had observed its contradictions, defects, superfluities, confusion, as he tells us; and undertook to purge it. But he too left much uncorrected. John Henry Michaelis and Opitius contributed a little to the same work, but only a little compared with their two great predecessors.

It has been disputed whether, after the settlement of the Masoretic text, it be likely that it was altered conformably to the Targums. Eichhorn believes* that many a MS. was made conformable to these Chaldee paraphrases. But Jahn,† with more reason, deems this improbable, because of the growing

* Einleit. vol. i. § 134, p. 372. † Einleit. vol. i. p. 400.

and great veneration which the Jews had for the original text as settled by the Masorah. Kennicott,* with greater probability asserts, that the Targums were sometimes altered to agree with the Hebrew text, of which he gives various examples. In like manner, Eichhorn thinks that alterations were made in compliment to the state of Hebrew grammar, when readings occurred which violated the established rules of it. But objection may be taken to this conjecture. Nor can we well suppose that the text was now changed agreeably to certain celebrated MSS., whose correctness gave them a claim to be taken as the basis of other copies or as sources whence others should be corrected. Eight such MSS. are mentioned by learned Rabbins, ex. gr.—

1. The MS. of Hillel. This exemplar (סֵפֶר) is mentioned by many Jewish writers, such as David Kimchi, Rabbi Moses Nachmanides, Elias Levita, Rabbi Menachem de Lonzano, and by Rabbi Zacut in his treatise Juchasin. It is probable, as Cappel, Joh. Morin, and Simon thought, that the Hillel in question was the rector of an academy in Spain, who revised at least in some places the Masoretic text after ancient copies. It is certain from the testimony of the Jews themselves that his exemplar had the vowel points.

2. Codex *Babylonius*, supposed to be the recension or rather revision made by Ben Naphtali of Babylon, which the Oriental or Babylonian Jews followed.

3. Codex *Palaestinus*, *Israel*, *Hierosolymitanus*, *Egyptius*, supposed in like manner to contain the recension of Ben Asher in Palestine, and adopted by the Palestinian Jews.

4. An Egyptian MS., written at Jerusalem, and taken thence to Egypt.

5. Codex *Sinai*, a MS. of the Pentateuch mentioned by Elias Levita, said to be exceedingly exact in the punctuation.

6. The Pentateuch of *Jericho*, thought to be the most cor-

* Second Dissertation on the state of the printed text, p. 177, et seq.

rect with regard to the *matres lectionis*. This copy is frequently quoted by Menachem de Lonzano, and also by Elias Levita.

7. Codex *Sanbuki* mentioned by Menachem de Lonzano.

8. The book *Taggin*, mentioned by Jacob Ben Chayim in the preface to his edition of the Bible, and extending only to the Pentateuch.

Probably these MSS. contained the text lying at the basis of the Masorah most faithfully and fully; and therefore they were in great repute among the Rabbins of the middle ages.

CHAPTER IX.

FROM THE FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE MASORETIC TEXT, AND THE DEPARTURE OF THE LEARNED JEWS FROM THE EAST, TILL PART OF THE BIBLE FIRST APPEARED IN PRINT; OR FROM A.D. 1040 TILL A.D. 1477.

THE Jewish academies which gained for themselves so high a position because of their study of the Hebrew Bible, especially those in Palestine and Babylon, continued to flourish till the commencement of the eleventh century. But about that time their learned inmates were obliged by the Arabs to leave their places of abode and settle elsewhere. They fled to Europe, especially to Spain, which became in consequence the seat of the critical study of the Bible—the country where the most correct MSS. were made. Here flourished Aben Ezra and Moses Maimonides. From Spain, Jewish learning spread immediately into Italy, Germany, and France, where Salomon Jarchi and David Kimchi were conspicuous. All these gave great attention to the Hebrew text. They searched for the celebrated MSS. of an older date or at least for extracts from them; adhered to those which were said to be well corrected; divided verses otherwise than the usual way; but differed from one another in the division and pointing of words. Yet their studies had a comparatively small influence on the state of the text, because its general character had been already fixed. Their critical principles were sound in the main, and exercised some effect on the purity of the text,

inasmuch as they succeeded in procuring several very accurate MSS. of an ancient date or extracts from them, whose readings are sometimes at variance with the received text.

In their time it cannot be supposed that transcribers had become so very careless as to allow many departures from the Masorah, notwithstanding the complaint of Meyer Hallevi of Toledo, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, about corruptions in the text of the Pentateuch. The *scriptio plena* and *defectiva* is what he chiefly refers to; and this is a mere difference of *orthography*.*

On the whole, we feel grateful to the God of Providence for his watchful care over the Old Testament Scriptures. Through the instrumentality of the Jews He has preserved the sacred books containing his revealed will. The reverent attention which this people gave to the Hebrew text, and the jealousy with which they guarded it from corruption, must have belonged to the wise arrangements of the Highest, who puts it into the heart of men to engage in works tending to promote His own glory.

* See Kennicott's Dissertatio Generalis, ed. Bruns. p. 113, et seq.

CHAPTER X.

HISTORY OF THE PRINTED TEXT.

HAVING enumerated the sources of corruption, and given the history of the unprinted text itself, we proceed to notice the various attempts that have been made to restore it to its original purity. After the invention of printing many were desirous to publish corrected editions of the Holy Scriptures, though they seldom gave an account of the materials they used. The history of the printed text is important as showing the manner in which our present copies of the Hebrew Bible were edited, and the sources available for obtaining the exact words of the original. At the present time the first editions are equivalent to MSS., and may be regarded as memorials of the state of the text at the time they were printed.

The Psalter was the first part of the Hebrew Scriptures which was printed A.D. 1477 4to (probably at Bologna). It was not, as has been erroneously stated, *the first printed book.*

This rare volume, consisting of 153 leaves, contains the Psalter divided into five books. There are no larger or smaller letters, no vowels or accents except in the first four Psalms as far as Psalm iv. 4. It is without any titles to the columns, without numbers to the Psalms and leaves, without signatures on the first 67 leaves, and without *custodes linearum.* The commentary of Kimchi is interspersed among the Hebrew text, sometimes after one verse, sometimes after two, and occasionally after six verses. It is in the smaller Rabbinical type,

approaching the German character. The text is very erroneously printed, with many abbreviations and omissions, bearing all the marks of a first rude attempt at printing Hebrew.*

The Pentateuch appeared in print for the first time in 1482 at Bologna, with the Targum of Onkelos and the commentary of Salomon Jarchi or Rashi. The volume is in the large folio size, and the leaves of glazed paper. The Hebrew character employed approaches the Spanish; but the letters are not of an even size. The text has the vowel-points and accents, and the *Begadcephath* letters have a *Raphe* in the first pages. There are no large *initial* letters, nor enlarged ones, nor *majusculae* and *minusculae*, nor numbers on the pages, nor signatures, nor *line-preservers*. This volume is thought to exhibit a beautiful specimen of *early* printing. The text is very correct, with the exception of the *matres lectionis* י and ו. Tychsen found but four mistakes in it, and says that the text agrees with Van Der Hooght's. (?)†

A few years later appeared the *former* prophets, viz., Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, with Kimchi's commentary. The text has no enlarged, *majusculae* or *minusculae* letters, no vowels or accents, except *Soph Pasuk*. The pages, chapters, and verses, are not numbered. It occupies the upper part of the pages, which are divided into two columns, while the lower is filled with Kimchi's commentary. The initial letters are large and adorned with woodcuts in Joshua, Judges, and Samuel; but these ornaments are wanting in the Kings. The volume appeared at Soncino in 1486, in folio, consisting of 166 leaves.

Soon after appeared, without date and place, the *later* prophets, viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor

* See De Rossi, Annales Hebraeo-typographici, p. 14; and de Hebraicae typographiae origine ac primitiis, &c. p. 13.

† See the Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Literatur, u. s. w. vol. vi. pp. 65-103.

prophets, with Kimchi's commentary. This appears to be the second part belonging to the preceding volume, because the type, form, paper and all other particulars exactly correspond. Hence it should be dated in the same year and at the same place. The text of both parts is not very accurate, and there are many abbreviations. It consists of 292 leaves.

The five Megilloth, *i.e.* Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, appeared the same year, also at Soncino and Casali. This edition has the prayers or *Machsor* of the Italian Jews, and is in quarto.*

Before this edition there had appeared in 1482, folio, at Bologna, the five Megilloth, viz. Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, with the commentary of Jarchi; and Esther, with the commentary of Abenezra.†

The Hagiographa first appeared at Naples 1487, small folio. This work consists of three volumes or parts. The first contains the Psalter, with the commentary of Kimchi. The second contains the Proverbs, with the commentary of Rabbi Immanuel the son of Jacob. The third volume contains the book of Job, with Levi Gerson's commentary, Canticles and Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Ruth, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, and Chronicles, with Rashi's commentaries. The text is in the square Hebrew character, with vowel-points, but not accents. The commentaries are in the Rabbinical character. According to Kennicott, there is a copy in the library of Eton College, of which he gives some account.‡

Thus all the parts of the Bible had been printed before a complete and uniform edition of the whole had issued from the press.

* See De Rossi, de ignotis nonnullis antiquissimis Hebr. text. editionibus, &c. &c. p. 5. † Ibid, p. 3.

‡ First Dissertation on the state of the printed Hebrew text, p. 519, et seq.

The first entire copy was published at Soncino, A.D. 1488, in a folio volume, consisting of 373 leaves. The first 100 contain the Pentateuch, Joshua follows, after which the former prophets begin on the 177th leaf, and the Hagiographa on the 265th. The text is divided into two columns. It has the vowel points, accents, *signatures* and *custodes*, with the titles of the books in the superior margin; but it has no numbers on the leaves, nor the greater and lesser letters. The initial words of the books are ornamented with woodcuts, but not in all cases, for a vacant space is left in some. According to the subscription appended to the Pentateuch, the work was printed by Abraham Ben Chayim. The edition is very scarce.* What MSS. were used by the editor we do not know. Judging however from the general state of learning at the time, and particularly from the character of sacred literature, it is not probable that the best or most ancient MSS. were employed. Kennicott says that its text differs from Van der Hooght's in more than twelve thousand instances,†—an assertion which is properly regarded as extravagant. Most of its readings are in later editions. The text is incorrectly printed. Typographical errors are numerous. Entire words are sometimes omitted, and one verse has been taken from the 89th Psalm and inserted in the 76th.‡

Another edition of the entire Bible has neither date nor place, in folio. De Rossi conjectures that it appeared also at Soncino. The type is beautiful and square, and the text correctly printed. The volume consists of 431 leaves. The text is divided into two columns, with the exception of the Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, which are printed verse-wise, with a few

* See De Rossi, De Hebraicae typographiae origine, &c. p. 41, et seq.

† See the ten annual accounts of the collation of Hebrew MSS. account x. year 1769, p. 147.

‡ Kennicott's Dissertatio Generalis ed. Bruns, p. 441, et seq.

pages in other books. It has the vowel-points and accents. In some parts it is ornamented with woodcuts.*

The third complete edition is that of Brescia, in small quarto, 1494. The books follow one another in a peculiar order, viz., the Pentateuch, Megilloth, the former prophets, the later prophets, the Hagiographa. The text is printed without regard to the Masoretic annotations. There are no *K'ris* in the margin, but the readings so marked are commonly found in the text. There are no larger, smaller, or suspended letters. The extraordinary points are wanting for the most part, as also the division of chapters. The type is small and difficult to read, especially in the case of letters alike in shape, which are indistinct. The edition has many peculiar readings which are neither in preceding nor succeeding editions. The editor, whose name was Gerson, had a Masoretic copy before him, but he did not follow it. It has often been asserted that it was taken from the Soncino edition; but there is no good reason for the affirmation. The differences of the two are striking. Nor does it appear to have been followed in subsequent editions, till Bomberg's second appeared, and supplanted all that went before it. The edition is now rare. The copy which Luther had in making his German version is still in the Royal Library at Berlin, where it is an object of curiosity to Protestants.†

We have now to notice the efforts of Christians in editing and publishing the Hebrew Scriptures. Hitherto Jews alone had been occupied with such labours; but at the commencement of the sixteenth century, the zeal of others was excited, and works of the same kind proceeded from them.

The edition in the Complutensian Polyglott first claims our attention. This work was prepared at the expense of Cardinal

* See De Rossi, De Hebraicae typographiae origine ac primitiis, &c. Erlang. ed. p. 77, et seq.

† De Rossi, Annales Hebraeo-typographici, p. 101.

Ximenes, who spent much time and money upon it, having purchased MSS. and got learned Jews who had embraced Christianity to superintend it. It was finished in the year 1517, but not published till 1522, at Alcala in Spain. The entire work consists of six parts, the first four of which contain the Old Testament, viz. the Hebrew text with the Targum of Onkelos, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate, in three columns; the external column having the Hebrew text with points but not accents; the middle one, the Vulgate; and the inner, the Septuagint with a Latin translation. The Targum of Onkelos with a Latin translation is in two columns below. The Hebrew text was taken from seven MSS.; but what they were it is impossible to tell.

Daniel Bomberg of Antwerp deserves still greater praise than the Cardinal for his exertions in making the Hebrew Scriptures more accessible and more correctly edited than they had been before. His press at Venice was devoted exclusively to Hebrew and Rabbinical literature. He incurred great expense in procuring Christian and Jewish scholars to superintend the text, so that it might be printed as accurately as possible. His chief assistants were Felix Pratensis, who had exchanged Judaism for Christianity; and Rabbi Jacob Ben Chayim of Tunis who continued a Jew. By the united exertions of Bomberg and his fellow-labourers, no less than eight editions were sent forth from the press, five in quarto, and three in folio.

The first edition in quarto appeared a year after the Complutensian Polyglott was printed, viz. 1518. In this edition the final Masorah is given at the end of each book. It consists of two parts or volumes. The various readings are few in the Pentateuch, but more numerous in the other books. The type is clear and distinct. It is certain that the editor used MSS.; whether he employed printed editions is doubtful.

The second quarto edition appeared in 1521. It is like its

predecessor in appearance, but the text is a little different, having received new readings from a collation of MSS.

The third quarto edition was published in 1525-1528. The fourth, after being partly printed, seems to have been suppressed. No person has yet seen it, but its existence is inferred from the numeral *fifth* being on the title page of the next one which was issued in 1544.

Of far greater importance than these were the *Rabbinical* editions which issued from the same press. As early as 1518, the very year in which the first quarto edition was published, came forth the first Rabbinical Bible of Bomberg in folio, edited by Felix Pratensis. The work consists of four parts or volumes. In addition to the Hebrew text it contains the Targum of Onkelos and the commentary of Rabbi Salomon Ben Isaac; the former and later prophets, with the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel and the commentary of David Kimchi; the Psalms, with the Targum of Joseph the Blind, and David Kimchi's commentary; the Proverbs, with the Targum of Joseph and the commentary of Kav Venaki; Job, with the Targum of Joseph and the commentaries of Ben Nachman and Abraham Peritzol; the five Megilloth, with the Targum of Joseph and the commentary of Salomon Ben Isaac; Daniel, with the commentary of Levi Ben Gerson; Ezra and the remaining books, with the commentaries of Rashi and Simeon. At the end are placed the Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch, the second Targum on Ezra, the various readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, with a few treatises. It is evident that the editor made use both of MSS. and of printed editions. Elias Levita spoke severely of the edition, chiefly it seems because Felix had forsaken Judaism. For this reason, it was not acceptable to the Jews, notwithstanding its value and the elegance of its type. It is now rare.

As the Jews found great fault with this edition, Bomberg

made preparations for another, and entrusted the editing of it to a learned Jew from Africa, Rabbi Jacob Ben Chayim. This was published in four volumes folio at Venice, 1525-1526. The great improvement in it consists in the insertion of the Masorah, with which work the editor was intimately acquainted. Into it he introduced something like order. He also made considerable changes in the Hebrew text by bringing it into agreement with the Masorah. He altered the order of the books from that in the first edition, and added other commentaries of learned Jews. On the whole it may be said that the text is regulated by the precepts of the Masoretes. The editor made use of Spanish MSS.

The first part or volume contains the Pentateuch, with the Targum of Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum, the commentaries of Rashi and Abenezra; the second, the earlier prophets with the Targum of Jonathan and the commentaries of David Kimchi, Rashi, and Levi Ben Gerson; the third, the later prophets with the Targum of Jonathan, the commentaries of Rashi and Abenezra on Isaiah, of Rashi and Kimchi on Jeremiah and Ezekiel, of Rashi and Abenezra on the minor prophets; the fourth volume contains the Hagiographa with the Targum of Joseph the Blind and the second Targum on the book of Esther, the commentaries of Rashi and Abenezra on the Psalms, the five Megilloth and Ezra, of Levi Ben Gerson and Abenezra on Job and Proverbs, of Abenezra and Saadias Haggaon on Daniel, and of Rashi on Chronicles. Each page is surrounded with the Masorah as far as the space would allow; and what was inadmissible there was put at the end of the books.

A second edition of Ben Chayim's Bible was printed A.D. 1547-1549, in four volumes folio, being the third Rabbinical Bible issued from the press of Bomberg. It differs from the former in several respects. The commentaries of

Abenezra on Isaiah and the minor prophets are left out. But several are added, such as the commentaries of Isaiah Ben Elias on Judges and Samuel; the commentaries of Kimchi on all the prophets and on Chronicles. Various notes on the Pentateuch under the title *Baal Turim*, written by Jacob Ben Asher Ben Jechiel a German Jew of the fourteenth century, are given. On the whole, this is the most copious and most correct Rabbinical Bible extant. As the name of another editor appears, it is thought that Ben Chayim had died before.

There is little doubt that this edition has had more influence on succeeding ones than any other. The printed text was finally settled after the Masorah.

The following editions followed Ben Chayim's, viz. the Rabbinical Bible of John de Gara, Venice, 1568, 4 vols. folio; the Rabbinical Bible of Bragadin, in 4 vols. folio, Venice 1617-1618. The small editions printed by Bragadin at Venice in 1614-1615 duodecimo; in 1619, 1628, 1707, in 4to; and that of Robert Stephens at Paris in 7 vols. 16mo 1544-1546, followed it.

The same text was printed, with some alterations, in the editions of Justiniani at Venice, 1551 4to, 1552 18mo, 1563 4to, 1573 4to; in De La Rouviere's Geneva editions, 1618 4to, 12mo, 18mo; in the three editions of John de Gara at Venice, 1566 4to, 1568 8vo, 1582 4to; in Plantin's edition at Antwerp, 1566 4to, 8vo, 16mo, whose text was repeated in Hartmann's editions at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1595 4to, 8vo, 16mo, 1598 4to; and in the Wittemberg edition of Zachary Kraft, 1586, 1587 4to.

The Antwerp Polyglott, 1569-1572, 8 vols. folio, of which Arias Montanus was the chief editor, contains the Complutensian text collated with Bomberg's. It was followed by Plantin's editions with a Latin translation at Antwerp, 1571, 1584 folio; by the editions having Arias Montanus's Latin version published at Burgos in Spain, 1581 folio, and at Leyden,

1613 8vo; by the Geneva Hebrew-Latin Bibles, 1609, 1618 folio; by Knoch's edition at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1618 folio; and by the Hebrew-Latin one of Vienna, large 8vo 1743. The same text was also followed by the Paris Polyglott 1629-1645, 10 vols. folio; and by the London Polyglott 1657, 6 vols. folio. It was taken besides into the Leipzig Polyglott of Reineccius, 1750, 3 vols. folio, and into the smaller editions superintended by the same scholar, and published at Leipzig in 1725 8vo, 1739 8vo and 4to, 1756, 1793 8vo.

A new edition was published at Hamburg by Elias Hutter, which presents a mixed text taken from the Antwerp, Paris, and Venetian editions, 1587 folio. This text was repeated in Hutter's unfinished Polyglott, Nürnberg, 1591 folio.

The edition of Nissel in 8vo, Leyden, 1662, presents a text chiefly conformed to the larger edition of Stephens. Others however were compared with it, such as Bomberg's second, and the edition of Manasseh. It is not very correctly printed. The page is in double columns; the type small and trying to the eyes.

Among those whose names are deservedly conspicuous in this department stands the elder Buxtorf, whose small Hebrew Bible was published at Basel in 1611-1612 8vo. The precepts of the Masorah were followed in the preparation of this volume. From it was taken the edition of Jansson at Amsterdam 1639 8vo. But the smaller and now rare edition was afterwards eclipsed by Buxtorf's *Rabbinical* Bible, which must ever maintain a high rank among those furnished with a critical apparatus. The work was published at Basel in 1618, 1619, in four parts or volumes folio. The model which the learned editor followed was the third Rabbinical Bible of Bomberg. But he did not content himself with simply repeating what had been already done. He changed various things, omitted some, and added others. The work contains

the commentaries of Rashi, Abenezra, David Kimchi, Levi Ben Gerson, Saadias Haggaon, and extracts from Jechaiah on Samuel. The appendix contains the Jerusalem Targum; the great Masorah as printed by Ben Chayim, but corrected and amended in many places; the various readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, and of the Oriental and Occidental Jews; as also a treatise on the accents. The Chaldee paraphrase was pointed by Buxtorf after the analogy of Ezra and Daniel.

The most recent Rabbinical Bible, and in some respects the most complete, is the Amsterdam edition edited by Moses Ben Simeon of Frankfort, 4 vols. folio, 1724-1727. This edition has various Rabbinical commentaries not included in Bomberg's and Buxtorf's Bibles.

The edition of Sebastian Münster deserves a separate notice. It was published at Basel in 2 vols. 4to, 1536. Besides having the final Masorah at the end of the separate books, the editor gives a collection of various readings which must have been taken in part from MSS., and in which the hand of a Jew is seen occasionally. It is this critical apparatus which constitutes the chief value of the work; for in type it is far inferior to Bomberg's editions. The text is supposed to be based on that of Brescia, with which indeed it frequently agrees in remarkable readings, but from which it also departs in many places. Bomberg's, as well as the Brescian text, contributed to the formation of Münster's. This edition must not be confounded with another of Münster accompanied by a Latin version and published at Basel in 1534-35 folio.

The next edition which claims distinct mention is that of Athias published at Amsterdam, 2 vols. 8vo, 1661. The title of the book which is now rare, is this:—"Biblia Sacra Hebraea correcta et collata cum antiquissimis et accuratissimis exemplaribus manu scriptis et hactenus impressis." A Latin

preface by Leusden accompanies the volume, in which he states that the Hebrew text was collated with the Bibles of Bomberg and Plantin, and with two MSS., one of which was written 1299, and the other, a Spanish one, was 900 years old. This edition was the first in which the verses were marked with numbers. A second edition was afterwards published at the same place in 1667.

The edition of Athias was the basis of others. With various improvements his text was repeated in the three Clodian editions, the first of which was superintended by Clodius himself, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1677 8vo; the second by Maius, at the same place, 1692 8vo; the third by Maius and Bürcklin, 1716 4to, also at Frankfort. Athias's second edition was also taken as the basis of Jablonski's edition published at Berlin in 8vo, 1699. There are also copies with a broad margin, giving the volume the appearance of quarto size. In the preface, which is of considerable value, the editor states that he collated all the cardinal editions, besides several MSS., two of which he specifies. From these sources he has given a very accurate text. The accents and vowel-points were particularly attended to, and Latin headings were put in the margin of all copies except those designed for the Jews. The paper and type are very beautiful, and the edition in all respects a valuable one. There was a second impression issued at Berlin, 1712 in 12mo, but it is not so correct.

The edition of Athias or Leusden also formed the basis of Opitius's, published at Kiel, 1709 4to. This is one of the most accurate ever printed. The laborious editor spent thirty years in its preparation. In the preface is given an account of all the editions employed, besides the MSS. he examined. The external beauty of it is far inferior to some others; but the type is large and the text exceedingly correct.

In like manner, the second edition of Athias formed the

basis of Van der Hooght's, published at Amsterdam and Utrecht, 1705 8vo. This edition has always been celebrated for the beauty and distinctness of its type, the accuracy of its text, and the convenience of it for ordinary use. The editor however does not profess to have collated any MS. for it, but to have made use of the best standard editions besides Athias's. The final Masorah with a Latin translation is given, and a list of various readings at the end collected out of the editions used by the editor.

Van der Hooght's text is contained in the very accurate edition published at Amsterdam in 1724 8vo, by Salomon Ben Joseph Props, for the use of the Jews; and in that of Sebastian Schmid, with a Latin version, published at Leipzig, 1740 4to. The same text was also printed, but without points, in the edition of Charles Francis Houbigant, which appeared at Paris in 1753, four vols. folio, having been preceded by Prolegomena to the Scriptures which were published in 1746. This Bible is splendidly and sumptuously printed, but its real value bears no proportion to its costly form. Critical notes occupy the margin and lower part of the page. The Latin version of the Hebrew text is neither literal nor very free. In the outer margin, by the side of the Hebrew text, the variations of the Samaritan Pentateuch are given in Hebrew type. The editor has sufficiently shewn in his critical notes the revised text which he inclines to; but it does not seem that his emendations rest for their basis on manuscript authority. He did not attach much importance to MSS. as sources of emendation. Ancient versions and the Samaritan Pentateuch were more acceptable to him. For these he manifested an undue partiality. It would appear that he *used* only thirteen Hebrew MSS., besides those of the Samaritan Pentateuch; and even these he could not have collated throughout or accurately. He was satisfied with a partial examination of them. Nine belonged to the Library of the Oratoire, and

three to the Royal Library. Only six however of the Oratoire copies are described in his Prolegomena; the remaining three containing the prophets he promised to describe, but did not fulfil the promise. What bishop Marsh says that though Houbigant *saw* and *had* others belonging to the Royal Library in his possession, he did not *use* them, is not entirely correct, for the editor himself states "vidi imprimis duo quae vocant *volumina synagogae*, quorum unum satis diu habui, *et saepe consului*."* We are therefore warranted in saying that he *used* thirteen at least. He has been justly condemned for his excessive use of conjectural emendation. Controlled by no authority and guided by no safe rule, he shewed himself a most daring critic. He meddled too much with the text, as if it were a thing to be rashly or heedlessly touched.

The text of Van der Hooght was also followed by Simonis in two editions published at Halle, 1752 and 1767 8vo. The latter is much more correct than the former, and more valuable.

Of greater importance was the edition published at Halle by J. H. Michaelis in 8vo and 4to, 1720. In the preparation of this edition, the editor compared twenty-four of the best editions published, and five Erfurt MSS. But it has been found that his collations of the MSS. were not thorough; and hence it has been inferred that the printed copies also were hastily examined. The text of Jablonski's first edition was taken as the basis. Notwithstanding all the care bestowed, the text is not perfectly free from mistakes; nor does it look so pleasing to the eye as Van der Hooght's. But it is certainly superior to it in value and accuracy. In the Bibliotheca of Le Long by Masch, it is characterised as "omnium editio praestantissima quae omnes praecedentes superat, et sequentes post se relinquit."

* Prolegomena, p. 107.

But all the preceding editions were behind the wants of the age. They exhibited nothing more than a text derived from a few MSS., and those too junior ones. It was known that a great number of codices were lying in libraries unexamined. No good critical edition had yet appeared, because the copious materials necessary for its production had not been collated.

The first person who seemed to have a right apprehension of the edition required and did much towards its accomplishment was a learned Jew of Mantua, Salomon Norzi. His work, containing a copious critical commentary on all the Old Testament books, the fruit of many years' labour, was published at Mantua in 1742, 4 vols. 4to, with the title מִנְחַת שַׁי, *Minchath Shai.* Norzi himself however did not live to see the fruit of his learned labours printed. About 116 years after the completion of the task he had undertaken, a rich Jewish physician, Raphael Chayim, had it published.

The critical commentary which Norzi intended to accompany the text, was the result of much reading and collation of copies. Having collected as many printed Bibles as he could obtain, with correct MSS. of the text and of the Masorah; having consulted the Talmud, the Midrashim, and the commentaries of the most learned Rabbins, he drew up his commentary. Raphael Basila the editor inserted some annotations of his own in the critical commentary of Norzi, and added others at the end of the volumes.*

Norzi had been preceded by two other Jewish critics, whose names stand out honourably in the history of Hebrew learning. The first was Todrosius, or as he is also called in full, Rabbi Meir Levita son of Todros, abbreviated into *Harama*, who flourished at the commencement of the thirteenth century. The critical work on the Pentateuch which he published in

* See De Rossi's Prolegomena, vol. i. §§ 37, 38.

Chaldee, is called *the book of the Masorah the hedge of the law*, first published by a Polish Jew at Florence in 1550. From the preface it appears that Todrosius used accurate and ancient MSS. which he followed in preference to the more recent; and that where they disagreed among themselves, he leaned to the reading of the majority.

In addition to that of Harama another Jewish name is conspicuous for his critical labour on the Old Testament text, viz., Rabbi Menachem de Lonzano, who lived at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and nearly at the same time with Norzi. He collated Hebrew MSS. of the Pentateuch, and made extracts from them in a work called *Or Torah.* He compared ten MSS., chiefly Spanish ones, with the text of Bomberg's quarto Bible, published in 1544, some of them being five or six hundred years old. But his criticisms relate solely to the Pentateuch.

About the middle of the eighteenth century, Dr. Kennicott of Oxford directed public attention to the state of the Hebrew text, and encouraged the hope that something might be done for the criticism of the Bible, commensurate with the labours of Walton, Fell, and Mill in the department of the New Testament. Having published two dissertations on the state of the printed Hebrew text, and being encouraged by the liberality of the British nation in bearing the expense of such an edition as he proposed, he published the first volume in 1776. The second issued from the same Oxford press in 1780, both in folio. The number of codices collated by himself and his fellow-labourers, the chief of whom was Professor Bruns of Helmstadt, amounted to 694. This includes *MSS.*, *editions* of the Hebrew Scriptures, and *Rabbinical works*, particularly the Talmud. The text is Van der Hooght's, without vowel-points or accents, from which all variations in the authorities are marked, constituting the *various readings.* The pages of the Pentateuch are divided into two columns;

the first giving as much of the Samaritan text in Hebrew letters as differs from the Hebrew; the latter the Hebrew text. Below the text are placed the various readings with a specification of the MSS. and old printed copies in which they are found. The poetical parts are arranged in hemistichs. A general dissertation closes the second volume, in which the author gives a full account of the MSS. collated, and the authorities consulted in the preparation of the work. This was reprinted by Bruns, accompanied by many observations of his own and published at Brunswick, 1783.

As soon as the first volume appeared, the expectations which had been formed respecting the edition were considerably disappointed. Perhaps however they were unreasonably high. Amid the mass of various readings collected by Kennicott with so great labour, few were found to be of much value in amending the text. The majority appeared to be the *lapsus* of transcribers. In this respect he was unjustly censured, as if he could have given more and better readings than what his authorities supplied. If the result of so much industry and toil be of little importance, the painstaking editor should not be blamed. He collated what MSS. were within his reach; and he could do no more. *One thing* his edition proved and that is of importance in the history of the Old Testament text viz., that existing Hebrew MSS. belong to a late period and exhibit but one text. They are all conformed to the Masorah; so that they belong to that recension which was made by the learned Jews of Tiberias. Their uniform state is owing to the influence of the traditions embodied in writing by these ancient Jews. Had there been no Masoretic labour on the text, this sumptuous edition would have presented greater and more important diversities of reading. If we believe in the *beneficial* influence of the Masorah, it is proved by this edition that the Hebrew text has

undergone no remarkable alteration or corruption. And from all that is known of the veneration which the Jews had for the sacred books—a veneration tinged with superstition—we cannot but think that the Masoretic text is on the whole a correct one. We cannot suppose that these doctors corrupted the materials they had in their hands. On the contrary, they employed them conscientiously and faithfully, knowing that they contained divine oracles addressed to their fathers.

But while the learned editor of this splendidly printed edition did not deserve many of the censures directed against him, he can hardly be exonerated from blame. He neglected the Masorah, as if it were wholly worthless. In specifying the sources of his readings he is not always consistent with himself or uniform in his method, as he ought to be. Some MSS. too were collated wholly, others only in part, when they might have been fully examined. As far as No. 254 were collated throughout, besides 290, 389, 615, 685; but the rest were only examined in particular passages. Neither was he very accurate in extracting various readings from his copies, though rigid accuracy is the highest quality in a critical editor. Again, where several letters are wanting in MSS., there is no remark indicating *whether* the defect should be remedied, and *how*. The MSS. corrected by a different hand are rejected by the editor without reason. Old synagogue copies are neglected in like manner, though they would have contributed to the value of the various readings. And Van der Hooght's text has not been accurately given, since the marginal *K'ris*, the vowel-points, and the accents have been left out. Nor had the letters of a larger and smaller size than the rest, that appear in the common text, their origin in the superstition of the Masoretes, as Kennicott supposes. Besides, the Samaritan text should have been given in Samaritan letters, that readers might see the origin of many

various readings. The exchanging of letters alike in shape is seen only when both types are exhibited. The edition wants extracts from ancient versions, which is a serious defect.

There can be no doubt that Kennicott was a most laborious editor. To him belongs the great merit of bringing together a large mass of critical materials. His apparatus was the first that bore any resemblance to Mill's in the New Testament. The task of furnishing such an apparatus, drawn from so many sources, scattered through the libraries of many lands, was almost herculean; and the learned author is entitled to all praise for its accomplishment. But his principles or rules for judging Hebrew MSS., and determining their age, quality, or value, are defective. In applying his copious materials he often errs. His estimate of varying evidence is often erroneous. He is not a consummate critic. He proceeds too much on the assumption that the Masoretic text is corrupt where it differs from the Samaritan Pentateuch and ancient versions; and therefore sets about reforming it where it is authentic and genuine. He wants the judgment, sagacity, tact, and skill necessary to constitute a masterly critic.

A work of a similar kind, but in many respects superior to Kennicott's, was published by John Bernard de Rossi, professor of Oriental languages at Parma, in 1784-88 four vols. 4to. The learned editor, perceiving the defects and omissions of his predecessor, was led to undertake the very laborious task of examining many important MSS. and ancient editions which had escaped the attention of Professor Bruns; applying better critical principles than the erroneous ones followed by Kennicott. Rome and the other cities of Italy afforded him excellent copies for collation. He had also a large number in his own library. Accordingly, the various readings contained in the four volumes were taken not only from Kennicott's collection, but from many MSS. collated for Kennicott re-examined, and the extracts from them rectified;

from 731 MSS. and additional MSS., and from three hundred editions; from the ancient versions, the writings of the Rabbins and the Masorah. The text with which his materials were compared was Van der Hooght's; but he did not print it. One especial feature by which the work is increased in value is the repetition of Kennicott's most important readings, as well as the statement of his own. The prolegomena prefixed to the first volume, consisting of 160 pages, with additional prolegomena prefixed to the other volumes, contain an account of the work and the sources of criticism employed in it, as well as a description of the MSS. and printed editions used, with ninety-three critical canons. In 1798, a supplemental volume was also published at Parma in 4to, containing extracts of the same kind from new sources.

The immense collection of various readings contained in the five volumes of De Rossi was made with marvellous industry and singular care by one who displayed a better judgment in such matters than Kennicott. There is greater accuracy in the collations. But though De Rossi was a better scholar than his predecessor and produced a much superior work, it is doubtful whether he be entitled to the appellation of a *consummate critic.* His theory of criticism is not sound. His principles and canons are defective or erroneous. His prolegomena should therefore be read with discrimination, except in those parts where he describes his MSS. and editions, which are singularly accurate and exact, with the exception perhaps of the dates assigned to some old unprinted copies. The readings generally are of the same character as those given by Kennicott, furnishing an additional proof of the fact, that all existing MSS. are comparatively recent and Masoretic ones, presenting essentially the same text as the one given in Bomberg's Bible by Ben Chayim.

There can be no doubt of the superiority of De Rossi's to every other collection of various readings. Those who can

dispense with Kennicott's edition cannot do so with the present. It stands at the head of all similar works before or since. It is matter of regret that De Rossi did not collate his MSS. throughout word for word, but only in select places. This is the cause of our commonly finding variations only where Kennicott or other critics had already marked a difference of reading. It will also explain the fact, that so few various readings *affecting consonants* appear in this work, which we could not have known otherwise.

It should be observed moreover, that we are quite ignorant of the principles on which De Rossi proceeded in adducing some variations and omitting others, in collating some passages and leaving others untouched. One thing is apparent that the learned critic was more solicitous about producing a great number of MSS. and printed editions, than about using such MSS. alone as were good and important ones.

The entire number of documents collated by Kennicott and De Rossi is 1793, viz., 1418 in MS. and 375 printed. But this is more apparent than real; for both put not only the entire Bible and a single book of it under separate numbers, but also every part of a book, and every fragment of a MS., though consisting of a very few leaves. Thus the numbers are swelled by an individual numeration of every separate part.

Doubtless it would have been better for criticism, had they consigned a considerable number of their documents to the moths and worms. If they had selected the oldest and best, and collated them throughout, we should have had more important readings. Many now given *do* affect the sense of passages; but in that case we should have had more of this character.

In consequence of the expensive nature of these two works, which England and Italy had the honour of giving to the world, a small edition of the Hebrew Scriptures, containing a selection of the more important readings, was superintended

by Doederlein and Meisner, and published at Leipzig, 1793 in one volume small octavo, frequently bound in two. It was intended for the use of students and others. The text adopted was Reineccius's. Both the type and paper of the edition are bad. The type is small, the vowel-points frequently illegible and often wrong.

Of much more value is the edition of Jahn published at Vienna in 4 vols. 8vo 1806. The text is Van der Hooght's, with the exception of nine or ten places where the editor changed the readings on sufficient authority. The Jewish order of the books is not followed, but they are arranged rather according to Christian ideas. The chief value of the edition consists in the select various readings found below each page, with the authorities clearly and distinctly given, MSS., versions, and printed editions. Most of the Masoretic notes commonly appended to the margin of Bibles are retained. Annexed to the fourth volume is a brief description of all the codices and editions collated by Kennicott and De Rossi, which may serve many as a substitute for the want of the former's *Generalis Dissertatio*, and the latter's *Prolegomena*. The learned editor has given the books of the Chronicles in fragments, mostly in parallel columns with other books. Though this arrangement has its advantages, it has also serious disadvantages which on the whole preponderate. The poetical books and the poetical fragments are properly arranged in hemistichs. In the text the vowel-points are given, but only the principal accents are retained. The typography is good, clear, and distinct; but the paper is inferior in colour. It is to be regretted that this valuable and convenient manual edition has now become scarce and dear.

In the year 1810, B. Boothroyd began to issue in parts, from his private press in Pontefract, an edition of the Hebrew Scriptures without points, " after the text of Kennicott, with the chief various readings selected from his collation of He-

brew MSS., from that of De Rossi, and from the ancient versions, accompanied with English notes critical, philological, and explanatory." The work was completed in two volumes, 4to 1816. Useful in some respects as this edition may be, it is by no means what might have been reasonably expected. The editor paid great deference to the opinions of Kennicott, Houbigant and others who interfered with the text in too many instances. He also deferred unduly to the authority of the Samaritan text and of the ancient versions. He has no claim therefore to the title of a good or sound critic, having a very imperfect apprehension of the value and claims of different witnesses in favour of or against certain readings of the text. The type of the work is good and clear, but the paper is of inferior quality.

In 1831, Dr. Hahn superintended a manual edition exhibiting Van der Hooght's text but freeing it from as many errors as could be detected. A still more correct edition was published at Leipzig in 1832, which was stereotyped by Tauchnitz. Both appeared in an octavo form. The type is remarkably clear and good; and the edition very convenient, correct, and useful.

Van der Hooght's text was also retained in a very accurate edition published at London and superintended by Judah d'Allemand in 1822 8vo. A second edition of the same was revised by Hurwitz.

On the whole, the text of Van der Hooght may be regarded as the *textus receptus;* just as the Elzevir text is the *textus receptus* of the Greek Testament. Almost all our modern editions exhibit it; the manuals in common use invariably.

Before concluding this part of the subject, we may refer to a large collection of variations between different editions of the Hebrew Bible found in Masch's Le Long. It is taken both from what are called *amasoretic* and *masoretic* editions; and includes many of them. Running as it does through eighty-

five quarto pages, it would be very useful to a critical editor in preparing a new and better work than any that has yet appeared in this department.*

In concluding this part of the subject—the history of the printed text—it will be apparent that the criticism of the Old Testament text is still in its infancy. Very little has been done in the department, compared with its magnitude and general importance. The labours of Kennicott and De Rossi are almost the only conspicuous ones in later times. And where they left it, it has remained. A critical edition of the Old Testament, like those of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf in the New, has not been attempted. Contributions have been made towards it; but they have not been all applied to the accomplishment of the work. A revised text founded on MSS. versions and quotations, has not been published. There is no doubt that such text is wanted. It is far more necessary in the Old Testament than in the New; for the text of the latter is in a much better state than that of the former. It was so even before the labours of Griesbach constituted a new epoch in the history of the latter. Doubtless the MSS. of the Hebrew Scriptures now existing are much younger than those of the Greek Testament, and in a much more uniform state as regards their text. Doubtless there are corruptions which none of the ancient authorities would avail to remove. The materials for emendation are fewer and less important than those of the New Testament. But these and other drawbacks should not deter a right-hearted critic from undertaking the preparation of a good critical edition out of such sources as are available. The text should by all means be brought as near to its original state, as all existing means for its restoration will fairly warrant and allow. It ought to be purified. It is high time that it should be so. A good stock of various readings has been accumulated for

* See Bibliotheca Sacra, Halae, 1778, part i. pp. xxxiv.-cxviii.

this purpose. Jews will not do what is needed. The Masorah restrains them. They have too much attachment to the Masoretic text. But Christian critics need have no such excessive reverence for the Masoretic doctors. Why then does not one and another attempt to supply a pressing want? Why have so many scholars turned their attention to the New Testament text, and so very few to the Old? It is a reproach to criticism in the present day that this great field has been neglected—a field in which there is ample room for many labourers. The criticism of the New Testament has been in its manhood for many years; that of the Old is yet in its infancy. We trust some well-furnished scholar will ere long appear to take away the reproach, by giving to the world a new critical edition of the Hebrew Bible resembling that of Griesbach for the Greek Testament. Whoever does so with judgment, ability, and sincerity of purpose, will deserve and obtain the gratitude of all who are interested in the advancement of biblical knowledge.

CHAPTER XI.

ANCIENT VERSIONS.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

HAVING described the state of the Hebrew text, *unprinted* and *printed*, we proceed to give an account of the means available for judging of its purity, and restoring it, in cases of corruption, to its original form. *The sources of criticism* are these—

I. Ancient versions.
II. Parallels or repeated passages.
III. Quotations.
IV. Hebrew MSS.
V. Critical conjecture.

Some have specified various forms which the Old Testament text presented at different times. Thus the form of it *before the close of the canon* has been distinguished. But this *precanonical* text cannot now be separated from the *postcanonical;* and even if it could, the only means of ascertaining and restoring it, viz. parallels or repeated passages, afford little assistance.

The *premasoretic* state of the text has been also distinguished. This is discovered and amended by the aid of ancient versions, by the quotations of the Talmud and Rabbins, and the Masorah.

The *Samaritan text* of the Pentateuch has also been singled out, as seen in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Samaritan-Arabic version.

Finally, *the Masoretic text*, presented by all existing MSS.

But these phases and forms of the text cannot now be separated. It is useless therefore to treat the critical materials according to them. Necessity as well as practical utility leads us to speak of *the Old Testament text merely*, and to describe all the materials of criticism with reference to it, whether as *premasoretic* or *Masoretic*. We apply all the sources to *the text generally*.

The oldest version of any part of the Scriptures in any language is the Greek translation of the Old Testament commonly called the *Septuagint*, either from the *supposed* fact of its having been approved by the Jewish Sanhedrim consisting of seventy-two persons, or from the Jewish account of seventy-two individuals employed in making it.

Among all translations of the Old Testament this has the first claim on our attention, not only on account of its great antiquity, but its very general reception by Jews and Christians. It is also quoted in the New Testament much oftener than the original Hebrew—a fact shewing that it was commonly circulated at a very ancient period, and regarded on the whole as a faithful version. The history of this version is unfortunately veiled in obscurity. The notices of its origin which have come down to us are suspicious. There are no sure data to rest upon. Hence writers have had recourse to various hypotheses, in many points contradictory to one another, and all resting on slender grounds. Amid the discordant accounts given of it we shall follow the one which appears the most plausible, without entering into a formal refutation of others that scarcely deserve attention.

The oldest writer who mentions this translation is Aristobulus, a Jew of whom both Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius speak. He is also mentioned in the second book of Maccabees. The doubts formerly thrown out respecting him by Hody and Eichhorn were dispelled by Valckenaer; but

others have been raised by Frankel,* which it is needless to examine. In a passage where Aristobulus wishes to prove that the ancient Greek philosophers, such as Plato and Pythagoras, were acquainted with the divine law, he asserts that before the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus and Demetrius, there existed a Greek translation of the Pentateuch from which these philosophers drew the greatest part of their writings, and adds,— ἡ δὲ ὅλη ἑρμήνεια τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου παντῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως . . . . . Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων. "The entire interpretation of the law was made in the time of a king surnamed Philadelphus, ... Demetrius Phalereus being actively employed about it."† It appears from this passage, that in the time of Aristobulus, *i. e.* at the commencement of the second century before Christ, this translation was thought to have been made when Demetrius Phalereus lived, and also in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The former seems to have been the promoter of the work.

Hody‡ has endeavoured to shew that this account contradicts the voice of history, and that therefore no credit should be attached to it. But when closely examined it will not be found wholly worthless or undeserving of belief. It has been objected to it that Demetrius Phalereus is represented as living in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, whereas he lived under Ptolemy Lagi. But this is a mistaken apprehension of the words, according to Hävernick.§ The sense extracted by him from Aristobulus's statement is, that Demetrius was the person who took an active part in it, or caused it to be undertaken; the whole *being finished* in the time of Philadelphus. But this is putting into the language of the writer more than it expresses.

* Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta, pp. 18, 19.

† Ap. Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica, lib. xiii. c. 12.

‡ De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, p. 49, et seq.

§ Einleitung, vol. i. part i. § ii. p. 39.

When it is said of Demetrius Phalereus πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων *immediately after* and *in connexion with* ἐπὶ τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως, the plain inference is, that Demetrius took an active part in the work *under Philadelphus.* And then nothing is said about the version being *completed* or *finished* under Ptolemy Philadelphus, as Hävernick assumes; so that we have no right to make Aristobulus say that Demetrius suggested it to one person and it was finished under another. His words do not fairly bear that sense. Aristobulus must either have made a mistake in the name of the king; or else he applied the name Philadelphus to Ptolemy Lagi improperly. Ptolemy Philadelphus caused Demetrius to be banished after he ascended the throne, because of a certain counsel he had given Lagi the monarch's father. Thus history shews that Aristobulus is wrong in writing Ptolemy Philadelphus instead of Ptolemy Lagi; perhaps he wrote Philadelphus, meaning the father. It is related by Plutarch, that Demetrius advised the king to purchase and read books relating to royalty and dominion;* and we know from Ælian† that he took an important part in the laws introduced by Ptolemy. It is also certain that this king was favourably disposed towards the Jews, numbers of whom spontaneously forsook their native land to reside in Egypt under the sway of a monarch so kind to their nation.

The account given by Aristobulus is confirmed by a Latin scholion found in a MS. of Plautus at Rome by Osann of Giessen, and described by Ritschl,‡ where it is stated that Ptolemy Philadelphus collected as many volumes as he could out of all lands by the aid of Demetrius Phalereus and seventy

* Regum et Imperator. Apopthegm. vol. viii. p. 124, ed. Hutten.

† Varia Historia, iii. 17.

‡ See Die Alexandrinischen Bibliotheken und die Sammlung der Homerischen Gedichte nach Anleitung eines Plautinischen Scholiums. Berlin, 1838, 8vo.

elders, and made two libraries; and that the king had them translated into his own language by the best interpreters. Here, as in the case of Aristobulus's testimony, the son Ptolemy Philadelphus is confounded with the father Ptolemy Lagi. What is stated can only be true of the latter.

It is difficult to determine the motive which prompted Demetrius Phalereus to set about such a version. It may have been a *literary* one. It may have been *political.* Or both may have been in the minds of the counsellor and the king. The words of Plutarch would lead us to suppose that the object of Demetrius in advising the king to procure a copy of the Jewish law was, that the latter might obtain information respecting the best mode of governing a nation, and of forming laws for its economic welfare.

The next historical testimony respecting the Septuagint is supposed to be that of Jesus the son of Sirach, whose statement is interesting, if it contain the judgment of a Palestinian Jew about the version. After requesting the reader's indulgence on behalf of his own translation, he adds,—*οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος, καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικραν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα.* "And not only these, but the law itself and the prophets, and the rest of the books, have no small difference when spoken in their own language." From this it has been thought that the law, the prophets, and the rest of the books were translated into Greek at that time, *i. e.* about 130 B.C. The author states that during his abode in Egypt he perceived that the Egyptian Jews and those of his own country differed in several important particulars as to their modes of expounding scripture. But this testimony to the Septuagint is equivocal, as will be shewn afterwards.

We now come to the account given by Aristeas, an author who describes himself as being highly esteemed by Ptolemy

Philadelphus, in a letter addressed to his brother Philocrates. The substance of this letter is—that Ptolemy Philadelphus, when founding a public library at Alexandria, applied by direction of Demetrius Phalereus to the Jewish high priest Eleazar, on the subject of a copy of the Jewish laws. As a preliminary step, he purchased the freedom of all the Jews in his dominions who had been taken captive by his father or himself. He then sent Aristeas and Andreas with magnificent presents and a letter to the high priest, in which he requested the latter to send to Alexandria seventy-two interpreters. The seventy-two elders were sent. They brought a copy of the law, consisting of "different parchments in which the law was written in gold, in the Jewish letters." After the king had entertained them at sumptuous banquets, he took them to an island, which, from the description, was Pharos in the harbour of Alexandria. Here they were lodged together in a magnificent house near the shore. They finished their work in seventy-two days. When it was ended, Demetrius summoned the Jews and their heads to the house where the interpreters had lodged, and read the translation to them. They approved of it. Curses were pronounced upon all who should venture to add to or take anything from it. The Jews requested permission to take a copy. The king received the work with reverence, ordered it to be carefully preserved, and sent the interpreters home with ample gifts both for themselves and Eleazar. According to Ussher, whom Walton follows, this took place 277 B.C.

The substance of Aristeas's narrative is repeated by Josephus,* both appealing to Aristeas's letter. Philo† also speaks of the translation; but he dissents in many particulars from the account now given. He says that the learned Jews sent from Jerusalem composed separate versions in the island

* Antiq. xii. 2. p. 585, et seq. vol. i. ed. Havercamp.

† De Vita Mosis ii. p. 600, ed. Mangey.

of Pharos, which were found to agree in every word, though there had been no communication between the translators. They were therefore directed by the Holy Spirit in every word they wrote. He adds, that in memory of the miracle, both the Egyptian and Grecian Jews repaired yearly to the island, and kept a festival on the shore. But he makes no mention of the ransom of captives, of the copy of the law written in golden letters, of the presents sent by the king, or the number seventy-two. The inspiration of the interpreters is a new thing, unnoticed in the letter. The name of Aristeas too is not mentioned; nor is his letter appealed to.

Justin Martyr, in the second century, represents the seventy-two interpreters as having been shut up in seventy-two cells, in which they had no communication with one another, and where they composed seventy-two distinct versions miraculously agreeing in every particular. He even says, that the ruins of these cells were visible in his own day, and that he had seen them with his own eyes at Alexandria.*

Epiphanius again makes thirty-six cells, in each of which two interpreters were shut up, and where they produced thirty-six versions exactly agreeing. He also furnishes each cell with a quick writer, to whom the versions were dictated.†

The narrative of Aristeas, enlarged with these fabulous circumstances by Philo, Justin, Epiphanius, and others, was received for the most part by the fathers down to the latter half of the seventeenth century, when the authenticity of the letter was questioned by Joseph Scaliger, Calvisius, Episcopius, Lightfoot, Cappellus, and many others; and afterwards denied for solid reasons by Hody and Van Dale, the former applying to it a searching examination which most succeeding critics have sanctioned as just. This eminent scholar *proved*

* Cohortatio ad Graecos, cap. 13.

† De ponderibus et mensuris, capp. 3, 6, 9, 10, 11. See Rosenmüller's Handbuch, vol. ii. p. 370, et seq.

that it contains particulars improbable, incredible, and contrary to history. It is therefore universally admitted at the present day that it did not proceed from a Gentile contemporary author; but was fabricated by a Jew *after* the time it purports to have been written. As it was known to Josephus, the letter must have been early composed. But though it be supposititious, and not the production of the person whose it professes to be, there is still room for inquiry whether the contents of it be *wholly* fictitious. Is there no truth in them? Not according to Hody, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, De Wette, and Frankel. According to them, neither the high priest at Jerusalem, nor the Egyptian king, had anything to do with the version. It was made by the Jews in Egypt for their own use. The religious necessities of the Hellenistic Jews prompted them to it. But we believe that *some* truth lies at the basis of the narrative. It has much of the fabulous, but also something of the true. Who then shall separate these elements? There is danger in rejecting too much; especially as the credulity which received the whole implicitly continued so long. We may run to the opposite extreme. This appears to be the case with Hody and the great majority of learned men who have followed him. Not content with shewing that the authors of the version were *Alexandrine* Jews, he denied that it was made by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, or under the superintendence of Demetrius Phalereus; that it was ever deposited in the royal library; that it was made by one person, or by more than one with any mutual consultation. And in these negative conclusions the great majority of critics have acquiesced.

But it may be inferred from various circumstances, that truth lies at the basis of the story contained in the letter. It is not likely that a Jew would venture to impose on his countrymen in so important a matter; or that he could hope for success in inducing them to believe him, unless one or other

of the things adduced had been known to them as facts of no doubtful character. And then the readiness with which such persons as Josephus gave credit to the story, appears to shew that some of the circumstances narrated were already known. The yearly festival instituted in memory of the event indicates that the version originated in the manner described. It is also worthy of notice, that when Clement of Alexandria* speaks of some placing the version in the reign of Ptolemy Lagi, others in that of Philadelphus, the epistle of Aristeas was not *the only* source from which accounts respecting the origin of the version were derived, for the king of Egypt is expressly mentioned in it.

It has been appositely observed, that the true way of ascertaining the real fact lying at the basis of the story must be found in *the design* the Pseudo-Aristeas had in view when he wrote the letter.† Now it is manifest that the writer's object was to exalt the credit of the version. Hence he sets forth, that the original whence it was made was brought from the holy city Jerusalem, the high priest and wise men approving and consenting. It was drawn directly from an authentic copy which had been preserved in the metropolis of the holy land. In connection with this, the king of Egypt and his library are magnified. That king was a great patron of the Jews and their law. He was most favourable to them and their religion. If such were the design of Pseudo-Aristeas, the version must have been exposed to animadversions. Its reputation was threatened. Its credit was likely to suffer. Perhaps it had been objected to because it originated in the command of a heathen king who had oppressed the people of God; and not in the decree of an orthodox ecclesiastical tribunal; that it was not taken from the sacred uncorrupted text of the Jerusalem copies, but proceeded from unknown persons acting without authority. Perhaps too it had been said of it,

* Stromata, lib. i. c. 22.

† See Herbst's Einleitung, vol. i. p. 150.

that a Samaritan copy had been employed in its production. Objections like these, as is not improbable, were heard against the version. Hence it was the writer's object to maintain its credit and uphold its authority. He could not deny that it was made by command of the king. It was too well known that its origin was owing to royal authority. But instead of representing the king to be Ptolemy Lagi, who must have been obnoxious to the Jews as having profaned the temple and maltreated the people of God, the writer put his son, who was favourably disposed towards the Jews. If Ptolemy Philadelphus were the king to whom it owed its origin, less objection could be made to it than if it were his father. And then what could be said thereafter against the character of the version, if, as the writer alleges, it was taken directly from a holy copy at Jerusalem—the translators themselves having been sent by the high priest? The text *must* be right, since it was reproduced from the genuine, Palestinian-Hebrew original.*

There is little doubt that the writer's object was accomplished by the letter of Aristeas. The reputation of the version was saved and upheld. Its origin and faulty character ceased to be spoken of to its disparagement. It was dependent on Palestine, and therefore it was received. It was faithful as a version, in consequence of its relation to the highest and most sacred persons at Jerusalem; and it was accordingly adopted thenceforward without hesitation by the Hellenistic Jews. We believe then, agreeably to the letter, that the version was made at the command of an Egyptian king. But that king was not Philadelphus. He was Ptolemy Lagi, as Irenaeus and others affirm. Most of the particulars contained in the letter correspond to the character and reign of Lagi, but not to that of Philadelphus. Plutarch and Ælian confirm this opinion. The oldest witness Aristobulus, and the scholium on Plautus are also in favour of the fact that the king of Egypt caused the version to be made and put in the royal library.

* See Herbst, Einleit. vol. i. p. 151.

But all that is said about the king's liberation of captives, his munificent presents, the Hebrew copy from Jerusalem, the sending of interpreters by the high priest, must be discarded as fabulous.

If this view be correct, that of Hody and others who hold that the translation owed its existence to the wants of the Egyptian Jews when they had lost their knowledge of the sacred original, must be rejected. It did not originate in the ecclesiastical necessities of the Alexandrine Jews requiring it for use in their synagogues. We know so little of the establishment of synagogues in Egypt, that any hypothesis assuming their existence at a particular period before Christ is uncertain. The translators would hardly have ventured *of themselves* to make it for ecclesiastical purposes; because the Jews in Alexandria were solicitous to remain in ecclesiastical connection with Palestine. They did not wish in any way to disunite themselves from their brethren there. To have taken that step voluntarily would have been contrary to their respect for the Palestinian Jews, to whom they looked as their superiors in piety and learning. But when the king ordered a version to be made, it is quite probable that the translators thought of the ecclesiastical purpose which it would serve. It would fall in with their religious desires and wants, though they would not have undertaken it without an external impulse. The design of the king was one thing; the intentions of the Jews who made it another. We cannot believe that it originated in a purely ecclesiastical motive, as Hody maintains. The king could not have been actuated by such; though possibly the Jews may have thought at once of applying it to ecclesiastical use. A political motive is more likely to have been in the mind of the king. Hävernick thinks that the design of it was a literary one,* which is the least probable of all the conjectures that have been entertained.

* Einleit. part i. § ii. p. 41.

How much of the Old Testament was translated at first in consequence of the king's wish?

This question has been variously answered. The words of Aristobulus are ambiguous. Valckenaer* and Hävernick† argue that they imply the translation of *all the books*. The expression τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου is not wholly decisive for the Pentateuch alone; since all the books were occasionally spoken of under the one appellation νόμος, *law*. But as the translation was made by degrees, not at once, it is more probable that νόμος should be understood in its proper sense. The Pentateuch was translated first. This is the only part of the Old Testament which the king ordered to be translated. The reasoning of Hävernick to show that Aristobulus's words mean *all* the books is more ingenious than probable. It is plausible but unsound. That Aristobulus meant only the five books of Moses is strengthened by the fact that Aristeas, Josephus, Philo, the Talmudists, and Jerome, speak only of the law being translated at first.

But who was the king of Egypt whom Demetrius advised to procure a copy of the Jewish laws? We have seen that Aristobulus calls him Ptolemy Philadelphus. There is probably a mistake here. The same thing is implied in the words of the ancient scholium already alluded to, where we must believe the same mistake to be made. The Pseudo-Aristeas confounded the father and the son, Ptolemy Lagi and Ptolemy Philadelphus, on purpose. Irenaeus gives Lagi. So does Theodoret. Several of the Rabbins also speak of him. And it may be gathered from the words of Clement of Alexandria, that it was more commonly attributed to the father than the son. But a great many writers following the Pseudo-Aristeas, attribute the version to Ptolemy the son. Philo, Josephus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem,

* Diatribe de Aristobulo Judaeo, p. 61, et seq. † Einleit. p. 41.

Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Basil, and others, appear to have adopted this opinion from the letter.

In order to reconcile these conflicting statements, Hody assigned the version to those two years during which Philadelphus reigned conjointly with his father, about 286-285 B.C.* We are more disposed, however, to attribute the mention of Philadelphus to a mistake on the part of Aristobulus and the writer of the scholium on Plutarch; while the design of the Pseudo-Aristeas in confounding the father and the son was to save the credit of the version. Later authors naturally adopted the view given by Aristeas, because they believed in the authenticity of his letter. All the circumstances of the letter itself agree best with Lagi; Plutarch and Ælian refer to him; and the connection of Demetrius with Lagi and with the version, which cannot be discarded, is upheld. But on the other hand, the connection of Demetrius with Philadelphus as confidential adviser or prime minister is so very questionable, that it can be upheld only at the expense of refusing him all share in the work. He cannot have taken an active part in it, if Philadelphus the son be the king who ordered it to be made.

That the translator or translators of the Pentateuch were Alexandrine not Palestinian Jews, is manifest from the character of the version itself. It is written in the Alexandrine-Greek dialect. *The spirit* that breathes throughout it agrees with the language in proving that it did not proceed from the Jews of Palestine. Hody has also adduced various expressions which, in his opinion, could only have been known to persons who had lived in Egypt for a considerable time. But though he has been followed by such writers as Eichhorn, Jahn, Herbst, &c. in bringing forward these proofs, many of them are worthless or weak. Thus he says that the Hebrew word שקל is translated δίδραχμος in Gen. xxiii. 15, 16; Exod. xxi. 32; xxx. 13.

* De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, p. 91.

Now Josephus* and Jerome† affirm, that the shekel contained four drachmae. But the Alexandrine talent was double the Attic one, and so was the drachma. Surely however the Palestinian Jews at this time were as well acquainted with Alexandrine as with Attic money. Adopting, as the translator did, a Grecian coin to express the value of the Hebrew, he acted naturally in taking that which was current at Alexandria, though he may have been a Palestinian Jew. Such an example as this is totally worthless when we recollect that the translators have sometimes given *Chaldee* meanings to words, because the Syro-Chaldaic idiom then prevalent in Palestine was known to them, as may be seen in Isaiah iv. 2; liii. 10.‡

Again, the Hebrew measure אֵיפָה *Ephah*, is expressed οἴφι in the way the Egyptians pronounced it; and οἴφι is an Egyptian measure.§ Thus Hody reasons. The authority of Hesychius is quoted for οἴφι being an Egyptian measure. But his is a very insufficient name on this point. Besides, in Exod. xvi. 36, the Hebrew עֲשִׂירִית הָאֵיפָה is translated τὸ δέκατον τῶν τριῶν μέτρων. Why was a paraphrase of *Ephah* put instead of the alleged well known οἴφι? It is likely that the translator merely left the Hebrew *Ephah* untranslated οἰφά, which became οἰφί.

The creation of the world is not termed κτίσις but γένεσις, the term used by the Egyptian philosophers; and therefore the title of the first book of Moses is γένεσις. This is another argument. But it is probable that the translators themselves did not put the title. It was of later origin. Besides, γένεσις would have been the most suitable word for the translator's purpose, as has been shewn by Thiersch.‖

Again, ἀλήθεια, *truth*, is the translation of תֻּמִּים *Thummim*,

* Antiq. iii. 9. † In Ezekiel, cap. iv.

‡ Comp. Gesenius, Commentar ueber den Jesaia, vol. i. p. 63.

§ See Levit. v. 11; vi. 20; Numb. v. 15; xxv. 5; Ruth ii. 17, &c.

‖ De Pentateuchi versione Alexand. &c. pp. 78, 79.

whereas the Hebrew signifies *perfection*. Why is this? Because ἀλήθεια was the appellation of the image made of sapphire jewels depending from the neck of the supreme judge in Egypt who was also a priest, as two passages from Ælian and Diodorus shew.* It is more likely that ἀλήθεια was chosen because it was reckoned a good free translation, than for the reason assigned. Indeed it is more so, for *a Jew* would hardly have adopted a word appropriated to the *likeness* of any thing. Diodorus calls the ornament ζώδιον, *a little animal, a small figure*. Besides, *truth* is a proper translation of the Hebrew word, independently of every external consideration, as Gesenius admits. Other proofs of this kind are equally weak, such as ἱππόδρομος for כִּבְרַת, Gen. xxxv. 16; xlviii. 7; whereas the Hebrew word was simply left untranslated from ignorance of its meaning, and ἱππόδρομος was subsequently added by persons who perceived the mistake into which the original translator fell; † κόνδυ for גָּבִיעַ, Gen. xliv. 2, &c.

More to the purpose are other examples adduced by Hody, such as the translation of the Hebrew צָפְנַת־פַּעְנֵחַ by ψονθομφανήχ. Here, by a little alteration in the word, the translation expressed the genuine form of the Egyptian appellation more accurately than the Hebrew. It is compounded of the article and two others which mean *the salvation* or *Saviour of the world, servator mundi*, as Jerome rightly interprets it. The change from the Hebrew in the form of the Greek name could only have been made by one acquainted with Egyptian, and therefore it is very probable the translator belonged to Egypt.

Again, the Egyptian word אָחוּ in Gen. xli. 2, 18, is retained by the translator ἄχε or ἄχει without being rendered into Greek. The same Egyptian term is given by the tran-

* Hody, pp. 113, 114.

† See Thiersch, De Pentateuchi versione Alexand. &c. p. 79.

slator of Isaiah for the Hebrew עָרוֹת, τὸ ἀχὶ τὸ χλώρον, the τὸ χλώρον being a gloss which was added to the text, so that there is a double translation.*

It is also certain from the character of the text which lies at the basis of the version, that the MS. it was made from did not come immediately from Jerusalem. The high priest did not send it thence. There are too many variations between the Jerusalem text and that of this version, to allow of their identification.

If now the version of the Pentateuch was made at Alexandria under Ptolemy Lagi, it may be asked, when were *all the books* translated into Greek? At what time were the rest, appearing as they did at successive times, considered, along with the Pentateuch part, to constitute *one* version. The question is a difficult one. The whole *appears* to have been completed in the time of the younger Sirach, as has been inferred from the prologue already quoted. But the words in question afford no evidence that Sirach thought of a Greek translation. They would equally apply to a Chaldee version. We see nothing in them to justify or favour the idea that "the law, the prophets, and the other writings," mean those books as existing in the present version. And then supposing he *does* refer to our version, it is not easy to settle the time he lived in. It may either be between 246-221, or between 170-117 B.C., according to the Euergetes fixed on; for Sirach says no more than that he went to Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes. Apart from this passage in Sirach, no other has been adduced to show the time *about* which the translation was completed.

Hody endeavours to prove with a great array of learning,† that Joshua was not rendered into Greek till after the death of Lagi, because the Gallic word γαῖσος *a javelin*, occurs in it;

* See Frankel, Vorstudien, u. s. w. p. 40, et seq.

† De Bibliorum textibus, &c. p. 178, et seq.

and the Gauls did not make an irruption into Greece and the East till after Lagi's death. But little weight can be attached to such proof. It is just as probable that the Hebrew word like many others, was here left untranslated, and one of a similar sound in Greek substituted for it afterwards. The same scholar labours to make it appear, that the prophets were translated a few years after the death of Philometor. Antiochus Epiphanes who persecuted the Jews forbad, it is said, the reading of the law in their synagogues. Hence they had recourse to the prophets, a section of which was publicly read every sabbath day. Now Antiochus began to reign in Syria about the fifth year of Philometor, and died in the seventeenth year of his reign. The Alexandrine Jews thought it right to follow the example of their brethren at Jerusalem, and turned to the prophets also.

Such is the way in which Hody reasons.* But the opinion that Antiochus forbad the law alone, wants all historic probability. No conclusion based on his supposed interdict of the Pentateuch deserves attention. Neither the Mishna nor the Gemara speaks of such an origin for the reading lessons from the prophets. The prophets were translated *after* the Pentateuch. Thus much is certain; but how long is not known.

Again, it has been inferred by Ussher and Hody,† from the historical appendix to the book of Esther, that it was rendered into Greek in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor. The name of the translator is also given as Lysimachus, the only one of all the translators mentioned in the version itself. It is remarkable, however, that he is not mentioned by Aristeas among the seventy-two translators. In regard to the epilogue belonging to Esther, grave doubts may be entertained. It probably alludes to the apocryphal additions to the book, which are of later origin than the genuine portion.

* Hody, p. 188. † Ibid, p. 189.

Hody supposes that the book of Judges was not translated till after Christ. But his proof of this position is invalid. A passage in Philo's book *De confusione linguarum*, is thought to be taken from the Hebrew not from the Greek, as elsewhere. But it has been clearly proved, that Philo was ignorant of the Hebrew original; and his *supposed* allusion to it in this place not to the Greek, can be satisfactorily explained on another principle. Here, as in all other places, he referred to the Greek version.*

It is remarkable that Philo observes an entire silence respecting Ezekiel. No book presented so much attraction to his allegorising fancy as the early chapters of this obscure prophet. Yet his unacquaintedness with it is no proof that it was not then in Greek. Its posterior origin should not be deduced from the fact in question. The reason of his silence is deduced by Frankel from its being translated elsewhere than in Alexandria, and its lateness of coming to that city.†

Michaelis and Bertholdt also suppose that Daniel was not translated till after the time of Christ. But there is no good reason for holding this opinion. It is true that the version of Theodotion was in early use instead of it, and that the cause of the substitution was unknown even in the time of Jerome; but it cannot be inferred from this that the Septuagint version of Daniel was not then in existence. Frankel accounts for the fact in the same manner as he accounts for Philo's ignorance of the Greek Ezekiel, viz. that Daniel was translated in some other place than Alexandria, perhaps Asia Minor; but this is a mere conjecture.‡

Thus all attempts to ascertain the times when the separate books were rendered into Greek, are nugatory. We only know that the Pentateuch was translated first, and that the rest followed, probably at no distant interval, but not all together. The Greek language became so prevalent, that the

* Frankel, pp. 46, 47. † Vorstudien, p. 39. ‡ Ibid, pp. 39, 40.

pressing want of the entire Old Testament in that language was all the more felt after the Pentateuch came to be perused in it. There seems to have been no great interval between the version of the law and that of the prophets.

In regard to *the number* of translators, nothing certain can be known. The fable that there were seventy-two must be rejected. The version itself shews that various hands were employed on it; but *how many*, is an inexplicable problem. Internal evidence speaks in favour of the Pentateuch having been made by more than one. Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy are better and more literally rendered than the other three books, Leviticus best of all.* Yet there is an uniformity in characteristic renderings which would lead to the conclusion that the translators did not work independently; or that after the books were done into Greek, some one hand had to do with them all, so as to make them proper parts of one collection. In the Talmud there is a tradition of five translators; but that number probably arose from the mere number of the books.

It is manifest that the other books proceeded from different hands to the translators of the Pentateuch, and also that there were different translators in those books themselves. This is proved by Hody from the different way in which the same words are rendered in the Pentateuch and the other books; and likewise in the other books themselves mutually compared. Thus the Hebrew word translated *Philistines* is represented in the Pentateuch by φυλιστιείμ; in the other parts of the Old Testament, except Joshua, by ἀλλόφυλοι. *Thummim* throughout the Pentateuch is rendered ἀλήθεια; but in Ezra ii. 63, τελείοι.

Teraphim is translated εἴδωλα in Gen. xxxi. 19, 34, 35; but out of the Pentateuch it is always rendered by some other Greek word, ex. gr. κενοτάφια in 1 Sam. xix. 13, 16.

* An opinion in some respects different from this is given by a writer in Kitto's Journal of Sac. Lit. No. xiii. for 1851, p. 83, et seq.

Again, the Hebrew word for passover is rendered φασέκ in Chronicles, but elsewhere πάσχα. In the Pentateuch and Samuel, *Urim* is translated δήλωσις or δῆλοι, but in Ezra and Nehemiah by φωτίζοντες and φωτίζων. Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, and Job have a peculiarity of expression in the use of ἐγὼ εἰμί for ἐγώ; but it can hardly be inferred from this that they were executed by one and the same translator.

Other proofs of diversity of translators have been collected by Hody with great industry, in which it is shewn that *proper names of men*, which are the same in different places, have been furnished with different vowels by the interpreters, or have received a different form in their hands; that the names of deities or idols are differently translated out of the same Hebrew words; that the names of *places*, *nations*, &c. &c., vary in the various parts of the version; that the same holds good with the names of animals, trees, plants, precious stones, and other natural objects, weights and measures, &c. &c.* But this mode of proof is insecure, because one translator does not bind himself to the use of the same Greek word for the same Hebrew one in all cases. He indulges in freedom of interpretation.

The character of the version must vary in different parts, inasmuch it was the work of five or six persons at least. The best interpreters were unquestionably those of the Pentateuch. That portion far surpasses the others in fidelity and accuracy. The translators were well acquainted with the Hebrew language, had a right perception of the sense of the original, and transferred it to another tongue with fidelity and skill. Hence Jerome speaks approvingly of the agreement of the translation with the Hebrew.†

* De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, &c. p. 204, et seq.

† "Quos (libros Mosis) nos quoque plus quam caeteros profitemur consonare cum Hebraicis."—Praefat. ad Quaest. in Genes.

The version of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth gives the sense of the original in a majority of places. But there are many additions and omissions. A large number of mistakes have also been made, several of them glaring and gross, such as taking proper names for *appellatives*, and *vice versa*.

The books of Samuel and Kings are the worst of *the historical* ones. The version of them is inferior to that of the rest, having the same faults in a greater degree. The knowledge of Hebrew which the translator of them possessed was but meagre. He has many additions longer and shorter to the text; but omissions are less common. The mistakes are great and striking. False and arbitrary explanations of every kind are met with. It is remarkable that we find such erroneous renderings by the side of passages well translated. Ignorance and negligence are conspicuous enough.

The books of Chronicles are carefully and literally rendered, the translation exhibiting skill and tact.

The prophets did not meet with competent men. The translators had too little acquaintance with Hebrew and Greek, much less than is necessary for a text so difficult as that of the prophets. Hence they often fail in obscure passages, and give an erroneous view of them. Jeremiah is the best executed. Amos and Ezekiel stand next in order. The version of Isaiah is the worst of all the prophets, being wholly unworthy of the original. Nor has Daniel fared better. His book is very badly and defectively translated. Whether the Greek church rejected it on this account and adopted Theodotion's, is uncertain.* On the whole, the version of the greater and lesser prophets is inferior in value. It is tame and prosaic. The translators wanted both knowledge and poetic spirit.

The version of the Psalms is bad, equally so with that of Isaiah. The translator was not proper master either of the Greek or Hebrew languages. And not only was he devoid of

* It was not published till the year 1772 at Rome in folio.

the necessary knowledge of the two tongues, especially of the Hebrew, but also of taste and poetic elegance. Hence he renders slavishly, word for word, down to the very prepositions and conjunctions, without attending to the poetic diction, and the difference of Greek construction. Hence also he renders the tenses of the Hebrew just as they are in the original, the preterite by the preterite, and the future by the future. The comparative and superlative are paraphrased, as in the original. In short, the passages are exceedingly numerous where the translation is unintelligible and meaningless.

The translator of Proverbs was much more competent for his task; but he was hardly equal to it. His knowledge of Greek was considerable and he endeavoured to give an intelligible rendering; but he has deviated very often from the original. His knowledge of Hebrew was meagre; his mastery over Greek apparent. His version as a whole, has been praised as *the best* of the didactic and poetical books.

The version of Ecclesiastes is most literal. Even the particle אֵת prefixed to the object is rendered σὺν.

The book of Job is but indifferently executed. The translator was familiar with the Greek poets, and possessed a taste for poetry; but his knowledge of Hebrew was very limited. The poetical portions are often defective. He has left out much, probably because he felt himself unable to translate it. In the prose portions on the other hand, there are considerable additions, mostly unsuitable ones. Origen and Jerome both complain of the omissions; and the former was obliged to supply them from Theodotion. The latter has observed in his preface to Job, that nearly 700 or 800 (versus) members of sentences have been omitted.

The Song of Solomon is better executed than Psalms, but not so well as Proverbs. It occupies an intermediate position in regard to value, being on a par with the version of Job.

The Pentateuch part of this translation has given rise to

many questions and treatises. From its peculiarities it is well fitted to do so. The questions it has suggested are perplexing, exercising the ingenuity and taxing the critical sagacity, of the most accomplished scholars. Their very nature is such as to impede a satisfactory solution of them. We shall allude to the principal topics.

It is well known that the Septuagint harmonises with the Samaritan Pentateuch in more than a thousand places where they differ from the Hebrew text. To account for this agreement various hypotheses have been propounded.

(*a.*) Hassencamp,* after Postellus, De Dieu, Selden, Hottinger, &c., endeavoured to shew that the Greek version of the Pentateuch was made from the Samaritan text rather than the Hebrew. Plausible circumstances have been urged both by Hassencamp and later writers in favour of this opinion, such as—mistakes in the Greek version which appear to have arisen from the interchange of letters resembling each other in the Samaritan, but not in the Hebrew; and the testimony of Origen and Jerome, who affirm that in the MSS. of the version in their day the sacred name *Jehovah* was given as if it had been written in Samaritan letters. But the hypothesis in question is wholly improbable. The text of the prophets and Hagiographa at the basis of the Septuagint, differs quite as much from the Masoretic text, as that at the basis of the Greek Pentateuch differs from the Masoretic Pentateuch. And then the Alexandrine version frequently departs from the Samaritan Pentateuch; while there may have been a closer agreement between the Samaritan and Jewish texts at the time the translation was executed. As to the letters, it is certain that Jewish and Samaritan letters were identical when the Greek translators undertook their task. The square or Chaldee

* Commentatio philologico-critica, de Pentateucho lxx interpretum graeco non ex Hebraeo sed Samaritano textu converso. Marburgi, 1765, 4to.

character did not originate so early. Hence all attempts at shewing that the translators fell into mistakes from the similarity of certain letters which are alike in the Chaldee alphabet, but very different in that found on the Jewish coins, are nugatory. Nor is it likely that the Jews would have received with so much favour a version made from the Samaritan, in which the name *Jehovah* so sacred to the Jews was written in the Samaritan character.

(*b.*) Another hypothesis which has been proposed to account for the general agreement of the Samaritan with the Septuagint, is the interpolation of the one from the other. This too is improbable. The Jews would hardly have altered their Greek version after the Samaritan text; nor is it likely that the Samaritans would have adopted the same method of correction. The state of feeling existing between the two peoples must have effectually prevented this mutual interpolation of their Scriptures. It is possible, that the Hebrew MS. or MSS. used by the Egyptian Jews agreed at that time more closely with the Samaritan than the Masoretic text now does; but subsequent interpolations will scarcely reach the extent of change required. It is a mere conjecture that the version was purposely conformed to the Samaritan copies by the Alexandrine Jews out of hatred and envy, as Rabbi Asaria supposes. The Alexandrine Jews did not so regard their Palestinian brethren. It is a mere conjecture also, that the Samaritan Pentateuch was interpolated sooner or later out of the Seventy, as Ravius conjectured, after Grotius and Ussher. Even though the closer agreement of the Hebrew with the Samaritan text originally be admitted, the great number of instances in which they now harmonise, and especially the character of them, clearly shew the hand of *interpreters*, not *interpolators*. The agreement frequently extends to the most minute things, and is such as would have escaped an interpolator.

(*c.*) Another hypothesis, more plausible than any former one, was proposed by Gesenius, viz. that the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint version both flowed from Jewish MSS. which resembled one another, and followed a different recension of the Pentateuch from the one that afterwards obtained public authority among the Palestinians, but that the Samaritan copy was subsequently corrected and interpolated by illiterate transcribers.* "This supposition," says Professor Stuart, by whom it is adopted, "will account for the differences and for the agreements of the Septuagint and Samaritan. On the supposition that two different recensions had long been in circulation among the Jews, the one of which was substantially what the Samaritan now is, with the exception of a few more recent and designed alterations of the text, and the other substantially what our Masoretic codex now is, then the Seventy using the former would of course accord in a multitude of cases with the peculiar readings of it, as they have now done. If we suppose now, that the ancient copy from which the present Samaritan is descended, and that from which the Septuagint was translated were of the same genus, so to speak, or the same class, and yet were of different species under that genus, and had early been divided off, and subjected to alterations in transcribing, then we may have a plausible reason why the Septuagint agreeing with the Samaritan in so many places, should differ from it in so many others. Add to this, that the Samaritan and Septuagint each in the course of being transcribed for several centuries, would receive more or less changes, that might increase the discrepancies between them."†

This hypothesis, more ingenious and refined than the others, is less liable to objection than they. Much may be said in favour of it that would be difficult of refutation. With

* De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, &c. p. 14.

† American Biblical Repository for 1832, pp. 714, 715.

some minor improvement and modification we should not oppose it. Taking *recension* as not necessarily equivalent to *revision*, but rather, in connection with the Samaritan and Septuagint, *a want* of revision as far as the text at their basis is concerned, the hypothesis bears a very plausible character. In the absence of a better it might be adopted. But it is not probable that the Samaritan copy was subsequently corrected and interpolated, as Gesenius supposes; at least it could not have been much transcribed, and therefore the liability of it to interpolation was the less. Some considerations *might* be urged as adverse to the hypothesis; but they are of a subtle character—not patent to ordinary apprehension. We shall waive all mention of them in the present place, especially as they are of comparatively little weight or importance. Yet we do not feel ourselves at liberty to adopt the hypothesis, however plausible it appears, believing it insufficient to account for all the phenomena. We admire the ingenuity of the contriver, but cannot fully go along with him.

(*d.*) Dr. S. Lee accounts for the harmony between the Alexandrine version and Samaritan Pentateuch in a peculiar way. The early Christians, as he thinks, interspersed their copies with Samaritan glosses, which were subsequently taken into the text by incautious and unskilful transcribers.* But he has not shewn that the early Christians were acquainted with the Samaritan Pentateuch or its glosses; neither has he regarded the reverence of the early Christians for the sacred books. Hence the hypothesis is utterly baseless.

(*e.*) Another hypothesis has been formally adduced by Frankel.† It is based on an opinion of Rabbi Asaria's, who speaks of an Aramaean version at the time of Ezra from which the Septuagint was afterwards taken. Although Jahn

* Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta, p. 55.

† Vorstudien, u. s. w. § 5, p. 32, et seq.

long ago termed this a groundless conjecture on the part of Asaria, it has been brought forward by Frankel for the purpose of reconciling the Samaritan Pentateuch with the Greek version. This Targum was inexact and paraphrastic. Its text was fluctuating, and had suffered much through the rash and unskilful attempts of persons who meddled with it. If now the Chaldee paraphrase was circulated in different copies which differed among themselves, and attracted less care in the preservation of its integrity, both the Greek version and the Samaritan Pentateuch may have flowed from it.

The great objection to this hypothesis, which appears very plausible on the first view of it, is the assumption of a Chaldee version prior to and at the time of Ezra, connected with the supposition of the late origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The first is certainly unlikely; the latter impossible. The Pentateuch of the Samaritans originated too early to allow of its derivation from a Chaldee paraphrase not long before, or at the time of Ezra.

In the present state of the question, nothing better can be proposed than that the countries where the Samaritan Pentateuch originated, and the Jewish MSS. at the basis of the Seventy had been in circulation, were much less favourable to the preservation of a pure text than Palestine or rather its metropolis Jerusalem. The peoples too who possessed the Pentateuch and the Jewish MSS. in question, were less careful of them. They lived amid less conservative influences than the Palestinian brethren. The Samaritan Pentateuch suffered in its text from the hands it passed through—not through any bad motive, but a mistaken desire of making it more intelligible, regular, and full. The Alexandrine Jews, living amid the influences of the philosophy that prevailed in Egypt, had little superstitious veneration for the mere text of the sacred volume. The translators too were more intent on giving *the sense* than adhering to the literal text. They were in-

experienced, and often failed in the difficult task they had undertaken. But why the agreement of the one document with the other should be so extensive, why both texts should harmonise so often where they differ from the Masoretic, we profess ourselves unable to explain. As yet, no satisfactory solution of the problem has been offered. Perhaps it is impossible.

Another question which has been discussed in connection with the Alexandrine Pentateuch, is the existence of a prior Greek translation. Here the words of Aristobulus have been adduced for the purpose of shewing that they sanction the fact of an early Greek translation before the time of Demetrius, *Διηρμήνευται γὰρ πρὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως, δι' ἑτέρων . . . . . ἡ δὲ ὅλη ἑρμήνεια τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων, κ. τ. λ.* But the words only mean, that *an extract* from the Pentateuch—a *compendium* of the law—had been made before *the whole law* was executed in the time of Demetrius Phalereus. And that this compendium was made *in Greek* is apparent from the context, notwithstanding Frankel's denial. It is not indeed so stated *distinctly*, but it is virtually *expressed.* If then there be no proper evidence for the existence of a prior Greek version in Aristobulus's words, is it likely, from the nature of the case, that such a one had been made before? Hody and most critics oppose the idea. And indeed there is little probability that a regular Greek version of the Pentateuch had been made before. In that case, the wish of Demetrius and the command of the king for the making of a version, had been superfluous. They are unaccountable. It is possible, however, that a fragmentary, partial translation may have previously existed consisting of pieces here and there, glosses, remarks on difficult passages, loose paraphrases of certain portions, which were supplemented, put together, and worked up into a proper and entire version—the version called the Sep-

tuagint. But we cannot allow that this was a Greek translation *properly so called* of the Pentateuch *made for synagogue use.* It is hazardous to assume the existence of synagogues in Egypt before Lagi's reign. That certain parts had been done into Greek we allow—mostly for private or social use; that glossarial annotations and notes on certain places had been made in that language may be fairly admitted; perhaps the essential portions had been transferred into Greek; but these were merely the rough beginnings of an entire version, the imperfect elements which required amalgamation, elaboration, and completion, so as to give them the character and form of an *entire* and *proper* version. They were fragmentary and fluctuating pieces, which had not obtained any general currency, as indeed they were not designed for it. In this manner, glosses are incorporated in the present Septuagint, which are as old as itself. Whoever undertakes a thorough investigation of the work itself, in the peculiarity of its text and structure, will probably come to the conclusion that a patch-work version of many parts of the Pentateuch existed before, pieces of which may be still detected here and there—glosses of equal antiquity with the now existing translation. Frankel,* with whom De Wette† sees much to support this view, does not hesitate to hold it. We are inclined to think that it has some probabilities in its favour.

Another inquiry has been instituted respecting the Pentateuch as at first executed, viz.—from what sort of MS. did the translators execute their version? Tychsen maintained that it was made from a Hebrew-Greek copy, or in other words, one having the Hebrew transcribed in Greek letters. According to him, the ambassadors sent from Jerusalem *transcribed* the Hebrew copy into Greek for the

* Vorstudien, u. s. w. p. 76, et seq. † Einleitung, § 42, p. 65.

king's use; and the Alexandrine Jews, or whoever they were that afterwards translated, made the translation from this Hebrew-Greek copy.*

The hypothesis of *transcription* into Hebrew-Greek characters is founded on some ambiguous expressions in the letter of the Pseudo-Aristeas, which might perhaps, if taken by themselves, denote *a mere copying* of the Hebrew text into Greek letters. But expressions are employed in the same epistle, which cannot be taken without violence in any other sense than proper *translation*. The doubtful phrases, therefore, should be explained by the help of the plain and unequivocal ones. And by whom, we ask, could such a transcript have been read, at the time it is said to have been made? It must have been unintelligible to King Ptolemy; for though acquainted with Greek, it is all but certain that he was ignorant of Hebrew. Neither would it have been intelligible to the Jews in Egypt. It would have rendered the reading of the Scriptures more difficult to them. If they were unable to read the Bible in its own proper character, they would have been far more incompetent to understand it when dressed out in Greek costume. Besides, the peculiar readings on which Tychsen builds his hypothesis in part, may be explained by *mistakes in hearing* without having recourse to an expedient contradicted by all history. The examples adduced in its favour fail to establish it. In short, it is utterly incredible that the Alexandrine version was made from a Hebrew-Greek copy. This singular notion of Tychsen was examined and refuted by Dathe, Michaelis, and Hassencamp; and though it was introduced into this country by Hamilton,† it found no favour.

* Tentamen de variis codicum Hebraicorum Vet. Test. MSS. generibus, &c. p. 53, et seq.

† General Introduction to the Study of the Hebrew Scriptures, &c. p. 114, et seq.

It is difficult to characterise the version before us; looking at it as far as we can in its original state.

It is obviously not a literal translation. The translators' aim was to make the original intelligible to those who were ignorant of it; to give the general sense of the Hebrew without faithfully adhering to its phraseology. Hence it is somewhat free and paraphrastic. Instead of representing *the person* and *number* found in the Hebrew, where there are frequent and rapid changes from one to another, the translators had respect to *uniformity*, and deviated from the original. In the same manner, the *active and passive voices* were freely interchanged to suit the subject and person.

In accordance with this departure from literality is *the amplification* they use. Words are added to make the sense clearer. Apparent ellipses are filled up, partly by additions and partly by paraphrase. But the translators not only amplified, they also contracted, by leaving out what seems to be double in the original.

In pursuance of their leading object, the translators frequently resolved *tropes* and *metaphorical expressions* into the *proper* sense; aimed at *paronomasia*, even where it is not in the original; inverted the order of words in a verse, so that such as came later in the verse appeared earlier; put the affirmative or negative where there was a question; translated a word twice, putting it along with two successive members; avoided expressions apparently indecent, by *euphemism;* and shunned anthropomorphisms by employing paraphrase or using terms more appropriate. The care taken in respect to this last feature, is very remarkable. The religious exegesis of the Jews also lent its element to the version; for we find traces of the allegorical spirit characteristic of that people.

These peculiar features of the version may prepare the way for the assertion, that the translators, generally speaking, were not masters of the Hebrew language. Many words they ren-

dered according to tradition, and where that guide failed, their attempts at giving the sense were either very imperfect or absurd, or the words were left untranslated. In the case of rare terms, they seem to have been in doubt about the meaning, and therefore translated them differently, sometimes in contradictory ways. Their mistakes too in regard to proper names were numerous. The same name was translated in one place, and in another left untranslated; appellatives were taken for proper names, and *vice versa;* prepositions were combined with proper names most strangely, so as to make a *single word.*

With their limited knowledge of Hebrew, we need not be surprised that roots somewhat alike should be confounded by the Alexandrines; or that they should have availed themselves of the assistance of other Shemitic languages, especially the Aramaean.

Examples of the several peculiarities here specified might be given in abundance. Various critics have collected a number of them, especially Carpzov, Hottinger, and Gesenius. But the fullest induction is furnished by Frankel,* who has contributed in different ways to a better understanding of the entire translation.

But though the Septuagint is by no means a faithful or literal version, its merits are considerable.. They have been generally acknowledged. It helps us to see the state of the Hebrew text in Egypt, perhaps too in Asia Minor, at the time it was made. Much more does it shew *the sense* attached to the original at an early period. Its authors lived nearer the time when Hebrew was a living tongue, and had better opportunities of knowing it. Unhappily however, what the version is most wanted for—critical use—it fails very much to supply. It shews indeed *a form* of the original text; but we hesitate to adopt it in most instances as *the original form,*

* Vorstudien, u. s. w. p. 163, et seq.

where it differs from the Masoretic. Its value therefore is least where it is most required. We can *understand* the language without it, especially in the present day; but it does not help towards the *emendation of the text* as much as is desirable. The free character of the version, and the liberties which the translators took with the text, are serious deductions from its *critical* importance. Its numerous errors and imperfections suggest caution in its application to the restoration of the original text. Since the majority of, if not all the translators were not fully competent for their task, it must be employed with discrimination. Assistance in criticism has doubtless been derived from it; and more will yet be rendered. We do not think that its internal value is commensurate with the reputation it has had. The extravagant praises pronounced upon it will be lessened by the study of its genius and character. It is very far from being a *good*, much less an *excellent* translation. But the reading of it cannot be dispensed with. Its position in the criticism of the Old Testament is conspicuous. Its text *must be* studied by every one engaged in biblical researches connected with the integrity of the Hebrew records. It will repay that study, by opening up views and suggesting ideas of the state in which those records were, which might not have been otherwise perceived. It will *contribute to* the restoration of the undoubted Hebrew originals—though it may not contribute *as much* as we think it might have done. Its value none will deny. The *amount* of that value may be differently estimated. It must be taken in the best state in which it can be obtained, and freely employed as a help towards the restoration of the authentic text.

In recent times, the opinion entertained by all the fathers till Jerome respecting the Septuagint has found an ardent advocate in Mr. Grinfield, who endeavours to prove its inspiration and canonical authority. Various arguments are adduced for this purpose. He pleads for the version as an integral part

of the Old Testament canon, co-ordinate with the original Hebrew. But his reasoning is unsatisfactory. Important as the version has been, it must not be exalted to an undue position. The inspiration of the translators could not have been verbal, as the writer vainly affirms.*

The Alexandrine version soon acquired a high reputation among the Hellenistic Jews. This is apparent from the fables connected with its origin, and the inspiration attributed to the translators. Even Philo believed in their inspiration, and used the version alone. But he seems not to have known Hebrew. It was read in the synagogues in Egypt. Nor was it unknown to the Jews in Palestine and Babylonia, or unvalued by them. It is spoken of in the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds. In the former,† it is described as having been made by King Ptolemy, who put seventy-two interpreters into seventy-two cells, where they agreed perfectly. Thus the fable of their inspiration appears; but the Jerusalem Talmud‡ is silent about seventy-two interpreters, their cells, their inspiration, or its having been undertaken by command of King Ptolemy. The Tract *Sopherim* in which the Septuagint is mentioned, does not properly belong to the Jerusalem Talmud, as has been erroneously stated. It does not belong to the Mishna at all. It was added to the Tract *Pirke Aboth* by the later Jews; but among the ancient ones it did not appear in the Talmud. Frankel assigns it to the eighth or ninth century, which is too late. The Septuagint appears to have been read in *some synagogues* at least out of Egypt, as may be inferred from the statements of Justin Martyr and Tertullian. The former says in his Dialogue with Trypho,—*ἡ περικοπὴ . . . . . ἡ ἐγγεγραμμένη ἔν τισιν ἀντιγγράφοις τῶν ἐν συναγωγαῖς Ιουδαίων*, "written in some copies kept in the synagogues of the

* An Apology for the Septuagint, 8vo. London, 1850.

† Megilla, fol. 9. See Frankel, pp. 25, 26.

‡ Ibid, fol. 6, Frankel, p. 27.

Jews;" the latter in his Apology,—" Sed et Judaei palam lectitant." *The Jews read it publicly.* It may be inferred also from 146 Novell of Justinian, ... " Praeterea ii qui Graeca lingua recitant, septuaginta interpretum utentur translatione;" " those who recite in the Greek language will use the translation of the seventy."* These passages taken and studied in their connections intimate, that the version was read in the synagogues, not only of Egypt, but sometimes at least of Palestine itself. The Talmud also states,† that the book of Esther was *read in every language.*

It must not be concealed however, that the places referred to have been subjected to minute examination. Some are of opinion that they do not warrant the view now deduced from them; and that the version never existed in the synagogues of Palestine for public reading. Of these Frankel is the most recent and conspicuous writer. But repeated consideration of the passages has brought us to the conviction, that Hody and Carpzov were right in their view; and that Frankel, in denying the fact altogether, has resorted to violent interpretations. It may however be freely conceded to the modern Jews on this point, that the translation was not read in any Palestinian synagogue *before Christ;* and that even afterwards, it was not generally used there; perhaps not at all at Jerusalem. It was in the synagogue at Caesarea, as appears from a passage in the Jerusalem Talmud;‡ but in that passage it is not stated, that the synagogue lessons were read at Caesarea in the Greek language. It is merely said that Rabbi Levi Ben Chaita going to Caesarea, "heard them reciting their phylacteries in Greek, which when Rabbi Jose heard he was very angry and said, If a man doth not know how to recite אשורית in the holy tongue, must he not recite them at all? let him perform his duty in what language he

* See Hody, p. 224, et seq., and Carpzov, Critica Sacra, § 7, p. 522, et seq. † Tract. Megilla, fol. 17. ‡ Tract. Sota. fol. 21, c. 2.

can." Thus the place alludes only to the *Shema* (a part of the prayers) and not to *Pentateuch-lessons.*

It is a proof of the estimation in which the translation was held by the Palestinian Jews, that Josephus made more use of it than of the original itself, though he knew Hebrew. In the Babylonian Talmud, the fable respecting the inspiration of the translators is repeated; so that the Jews generally had high ideas of its value and authority. Its celebrity was all but universal among them, wherever they were.

At the commencement of the second century and afterwards, when the early Christians were brought into contact with the Jews and controversies arose between them, the Jews began to look upon it with other feelings. Their attachment to it decreased. The Christians were wont to appeal to it as containing remarkable prophecies fulfilled in Christ. When therefore the Jews were worsted by arguments derived from their own version, they betook themselves to another version as soon as it could be obtained; if not to the study of the Hebrew itself. The Septuagint was looked upon with suspicion by them. They began to deny that it agreed with the Hebrew text, and disliked it. It became odious to them. Hence arose the Talmudic statement of a fast on the 8th day of the month *Thebet*, the day on which the law was made into Greek, to perpetuate the remembrance of an event so inauspicious.

After abandoning the Septuagint, the Jews generally had recourse to the version of Aquila, who is thought by many to have undertaken his work in opposition to the Christians, that the Septuagint might be superseded by a new version more conformable to the Hebrew.

The text of the version never attained a stable condition. There was no general revision of it. It fluctuated and shifted, having never reached equal authority with the original Hebrew. The same care was not extended to it. When therefore copies

began to multiply, the text of it was freely meddled with by transcribers. They did not scruple to alter, add, omit at pleasure. Corruptions were introduced into it early and extensively. There is reason to believe, that it had suffered before the time of Christ, as passages in the writings of Philo and Josephus imply. In their day, the text had mistakes in it. Indeed Frankel supposes, that it was almost in its present state in the days of Philo, having suffered much from two classes of persons.* But the time between Christ and Origen was probably the chief period of arbitrary changes introduced into it. Justin Martyr had a text that was greatly altered, at least in the minor prophets. In his writings, there are readings that appear in no MS., edition, or ancient father. The probability is, that he had copies which had been compared with the Hebrew, and changed here and there conformably to it; especially in Messianic passages. They had passed through *Christian* hands. When Dr. H. Owen tries to shew that the Jews at this time wilfully altered the text in many instances with a view to pervert the meaning of Scripture, he fails in his conclusion. The sources on which he relies are not trustworthy; neither are his conjectures happy.†

It is a bold task to undertake to shew the early corruption of the Septuagint text—that which had been made in the time of Philo. Yet it is attempted by Frankel. It arose as he thinks from two causes, partly through mistakes committed by *transcribers*, and partly by supposed *improvements* introduced into the text to render it more perspicuous. Many examples are given of mistakes introduced by *transcribers* from ignorance or carelessness; and many others are presented which owed their origin to *improvers* of the text. And it is probable enough that both classes had deteriorated the text before the

* Vorstudien, u. s. w. p. 62.

† See an Enquiry into the present state of the Septuagint version, sections iii.-ix. p. 16, et seq.

first century. It is likely that it had suffered. Some of the examples are apposite, being correctly referred to the causes specified, as far as internal evidence assists a judgment of the case. But we hesitate to allow that the ingenious scholar has been successful in all his examples, or even in the majority of them. His critical sagacity has led him to conclusions and distinctions which are nothing else than conjectures. He has *assumed* too extensive alterations before Philo; and set himself with microscopic skill to assign to two classes of persons respectively a number of alterations which seem to us to have belonged to the version in its original state.*

It is *certain* that there were errors in the text in Philo's time. Thus in Gen. xv. 15, there was τραφεὶς ἐν γήρει καλῷ instead of ταφείς. Of the same age seems to be ἱππόδρομον after χαβραθά in Gen. xxxv. 16, and xlviii. 7. The translator not knowing the Hebrew word retained it, to which the explanation ἱππόδρομος was *subsequently* added by an improver of the version. In the same manner a gloss was added to the proper name Ισσάχαρ, viz. ὅ ἐστιν μισθός, in Gen. xxx.

* Vorstudien, u. s. w. pp. 63-89.

CHAPTER XII.

SEPTUAGINT—(Continued).

Origen saw the lamentable state in which the Septuagint was in his time; how much it had suffered from meddling critics and correctors; and he undertook to remedy it. He wished to rectify a text so shamefully disfigured. It would appear from his own words in an epistle to Africanus,* that his motive for revising it arose in consequence of the polemics between Jews and Christians. The Jews were able to detect the differences existing between the version and the Hebrew original; but the Christians were not. When the latter adduced quotations from the Greek against the former, they were liable to be met with the reply, *such is not in the original.* This generally sufficed to silence the Christians, who could not pretend to follow their more critical antagonists into the original. Now Origen intended to help his fellow-believers, by revising the Greek text. He undertook to compare it with the Hebrew and other existing Greek versions, so as to adapt it to general use by making it more intelligible. He had therefore an *exegetical* object in view, rather than a critical one. In preparing for this great work he spent twenty-eight years of his life, travelling about through the East and collecting materials. When we consider the magnitude of the task and the labour it demanded, we need not wonder at the application to him of the epithet *adamantius* by the ancients. His indomitable zeal and

* Epist. ad Africanum. See Jahn's Einleit. vol. i. p. 164.

patience well entitle him to the appellation. In the course of his travels he was so fortunate as to meet with three anonymous versions, besides those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. The sixth version he discovered A.D. 228, according to Epiphanius.* From this till 231 he travelled about to avoid the Decian persecution, and then took up his abode at Caesarea. Here he arranged his materials, and composed at least a part of his work.

The *Tetrapla* was first published, containing in four columns, the Seventy, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. In the first column was the text of the ἡ κοινή, corrected by MSS. *of itself*, as Holmes shews.† The order of the columns was that stated, the Septuagint occupying the first place, as Walton rightly asserts. It is true that Hody affirms the contrary, relying on the authority of Epiphanius. But Eusebius, who is more to be relied on, seems to intimate that the Septuagint stood first in the Tetrapla.‡

The following is a specimen of the Tetrapla :—

Gen. i. 1.

Οἱ Ο.	Ἀκύλας.	Σύμμαχος.	Θεοδοτίων.
Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.	Ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν.	Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.	Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.

* De Ponderib. et Mensuris, c. 17.

† Praefatio ad Tomum i. Veteris Testamenti Graeci, § 4.

‡ See H. E. vi. 16.

But though the Tetrapla was an independent work, as we gather from Epiphanius, Eusebius, and the scholia of Greek MSS., it was but preparatory to his projected Polyglott. In an enlarged edition he gave the Hebrew text both in Hebrew and Greek letters; and as there were then six columns, it received the name *Hexapla.* In *some books*, he used two other Greek translations whose authors were unknown, in which case the work was called *Octapla;* and a third version was likewise put, so that there were *nine* columns. Montfaucon says, that none of the ancients used the title *Enneapla*, *ninefold.** It is impossible to tell *the particular books* to which the *fifth*, *sixth*, and *seventh* Greek versions were appended. Jerome's statement is very general: "Nonnulli vero libri, et maxime hi qui apud Hebraeos versu compositi sunt, tres alias editiones additas habent, quam quintam, sextam, et septimam translationem vocant, auctoritatem sine nominibus interpretum consecutas."† This would lead us to suppose that they were chiefly used in Job, Psalms, and Proverbs. But the fragments of them prove that they were put in the Psalms and minor prophets. From the same source we learn, that the *fifth* and *sixth* were in the Pentateuch and Canticles also.‡

The following is the order of the columns:—The Hebrew text in its own proper character, the same in Greek letters, Aquila, Symmachus, the Seventy, Theodotion; the fifth, sixth, and seventh versions in some books. All these were placed in parallel columns to one another, as the following specimen will shew:—

* Praeliminaria, vol. i. p. 4, ed. Bahrdt.

† Comment. in Epist. ad Titum. ‡ Ibid.

HEXAPLA.

Gen. i. 20.

Τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν.	Τὸ Εβραϊκὸν Ἑλληνικοις Γραμμασι.	Ἀκύλας.	Σύμμαχος.	Οἱ Ο.	Θεοδοτίων.
ויאמר אלהים ישרצו המים שרץ נפש חיה ועוף יעופף על־הארץ על־פני רקיע השמים	Ουιωμερ ελωειμ ισρεσου αμαιμ σαρες ναφεσ αια ουωφ ιεωφεφ αλ-ααρες αλφανη ρακιη ασαμαιμ.	Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός· ἐξερψάτω τὰ ὕδατα ἑρπετὰ ψυχῆς ζώσης, καὶ πετηνὸν ἱπτάμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ στερεώματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.	Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός· ἐξερψάτω τὰ ὕδατα ἑρπετὸν ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, καὶ πετηνὸν πετόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, κατὰ πρόσωπον στερεώματος οὐρανοῦ. Καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.	Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός· ἐξαγαγέτο τὰ ὕδατα ἑρπετὰ ψυχῶν ζωσῶν, καὶ πετεινὰ πετόμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, κατὰ τὸ στερέωμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. — Καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως:	Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός· ἐξερψάτωσαν τὰ ὕδατα ἑρπετὰ ψυχὰς ζώσας, καὶ πετηνὸν πετόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, κατὰ πρόσωπον στερεώματος οὐρανοῦ. Καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.
Psalm viii. 4. אראה שמיך	ερεε σαμαχα.	ὄψομαι τοὺς οὐρανούς σου.	οψομαι τους ουρανους σου.	ὄψομαι τοὺς οὐρανούς* σου:	ὄψομαι τοὺς οὐρανούς σου.
Psalm xviii. 7. לרוץ ארח	λαρους ωραχ.	δραμεῖν ὁδόν.	δραμειν οδον.	δραμεῖν ὁδόν—αὐτοῦ: Jer. xliv. 22 (li. 22.)	δραμεῖν ὁδόν.

* Α. Θ. παρὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπάρχειν ἐνοικοῦντα. Jerem. xi. 13.

* Α. Σ. Θ. θυσιαστήρια. Jes. xxxviii. 3.

* οἱ Γ. Ὦ δὴ κύριε:

The following is a specimen where nine columns were used :—

Habbak. ii. 4.

Γὸ Ἑβραϊκόν.	Γὸ Ἑβραικὸν Ἑλληνικοις γραμμασι.	Ἀκύλας.	Σύμμαχος.	Οἱ Ο.	Θεοδοτίων.	Ε.	ς.	Ζ.
וצדיק באמונתו יחיה	ουσαδικ βημουναθο ιειε.	καὶ δίκαιος ἐν πίςει αὐτοῦ ζήσεται.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίςει ζήσει.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίςεώς μου ζήσεται.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίςει ζήσει.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίςει ζήσει.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίςει ζήσει.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίςει ζήσει.

The object of Origen in this laborious work was not to correct the Septuagint from MS. copies of itself, which were probably incurable and unable to furnish proper emendations. He wished rather to collate it with the Hebrew and other versions. He did not alter the version itself by erasing anything in its text but allowed it to remain as he found it, with marks serving to shew what it ought to be in his opinion. When he discovered, by means of the other columns, that the Seventy wanted something, he inserted it out of Theodotion, with an asterisk at the commencement, and the name of the source the supplement belonged to (*). When he perceived something superfluous in the text, he allowed it to stand, but prefixed an obelus to it (—:—). Two points after the word or words supplied, or those meant to be omitted, shewed how far the proposed correction extended, (:). Origen also used *lemniscs*, (—·—) and *hypolemniscs*, (—.—), the signification of which is not known. An example of each will suffice—Job xxxii. 12.

* Θ. καὶ μέχρι ὑμῶν συνήσω· καὶ ἰδοὺ
* οὐκ ἦν τῷ Ἰὼβ ἐλέγχων, ἀνταποκρινόμενος ῥήματα αὐτοῦ ἐξ ὑμῶν·
* ἵνα μὴ εἴπητε εὕρωμεν σοφίαν τοῦ
* θεοῦ προσθέμενοι :

Here the addition is taken from Theodotion.

Again, —:— ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ υἱοὶ θεοῦ : Psalm xxviii. 1.
—·— ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ υἱοὶ θεοῦ :

It may appear strange that the meaning of *lemniscs* and *hypolemniscs* is not known, as Epiphanius has explained it. But Monfaucon has shewn that his explanation is self-contradictory.* It is likely that a *lemnisc* was affixed to words in which the translations of the Seventy and Theodotion coincided; *hypolemnisc* to words used by Theodotion alone.

It added to the completeness of the work that the Samaritan Pentateuch was compared with the Hebrew, and their differ-

* Praeliminaria, ed. Bahrdt, vol. i. p. 81, et seq.

ences marked. There was also a history of each translation prefixed to it; prolegomena preceded every book of the Bible; and the margin was full of exegetical and critical remarks.

Origen's recension of the Seventy is called the *Hexaplar* text to distinguish it from the previously existing text called the κοινή or *common*, and sometimes the *antehexaplarian*.

The great work, consisting of nearly fifty volumes, on which he had spent the best years of his early life, does not seem to have been transcribed—probably in consequence of its magnitude and the great expense necessarily attending a transcript. It lay unused as a whole for fifty years after it was finished, till Eusebius and Pamphilus drew it forth from its concealment in Tyre, and placed it in the library of the latter at Caesarea. It is thought to have perished there when Caesarea was taken and plundered by the Saracens, A.D. 653. Such was the fate of the immortal work, which, considering the period and state of sacred criticism when it was undertaken, may justly excite the admiration of posterity. Its loss must ever be regretted.

But though we regret the loss of a work so valuable in the criticism of the Old Testament, it did not wholly perish. Extracts were made from it. In the beginning of the fourth century, Pamphilus and Eusebius transcribed the column containing the Septuagint, with the critical marks appended by Origen. Jerome says in his preface to Chronicles, that the recension prevailed in Palestine. This copy being frequently transcribed was soon corrupted. The text being accompanied with all the critical signs and fragments of the other versions in the margin, gave rise to innumerable errors. The critical marks were exchanged for one another; the initial letters of the names of the translators whence Origen took his supplements were also interchanged; or, the critical marks with the names were omitted, so that all was written continuously as if it belonged to the proper Septuagint text. Besides, pieces of other Greek translators in the margin were taken by

bold transcribers into the text. Nor was this all the mischief that rashness, ignorance, and carelessness united in bringing about. When such interpolated MSS. were compared with quotations from the Septuagint in writers before Origen, *ex. gr.* Philo and Justin Martyr, they contributed to those citations of the *antehexaplaric* text. Passages out of the corrupted, interpolated *hexaplaric* text were interpolated in the writings of Philo and Josephus.*

Fragments of the Hexapla have been diligently sought after by several scholars, by Peter Morin, Drusius, Martianay. From the materials thus collected, and greatly enlarged by himself, Montfaucon published two folio volumes (Paris, 1713). Bahrdt reprinted them in a better and more convenient form in two volumes 8vo. (Leipzig and Lubeck, 1769, 1770). Later contributions to the collection were made by Semler, Scharfenberg, Doederlein, Matthäi, Schleusner, Spohn, and others. As soon as the Syriac treasures obtained from the Nitrian monasteries and now deposited in the British Museum are carefully examined, and all the books of the Hexaplar-Syriac published, important assistance will be obtained in discovering Origen's Hexaplar text, with its marks and references to other translations. The *Syriac-Hexaplar* version ought to furnish new materials.

Other labourers appeared in the same department with Origen. New recensions were undertaken because of the new corruptions to which the work of Origen had given occasion. Thus Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, at the commencement of the fourth century, amended the text of the Seventy. The accounts of this work given in ancient writers are very defective, and the principles he followed unknown. Holmes thinks that the Hexaplar text was used by him,† though the great work itself of Origen he had not seen. The recension of

* See Eichhorn's Einleitung, vol. i. § 173, p. 499, et seq.

† Praefatio ad tom. i. Veteris Testamenti Graeci, sectio ix.

Lucian was called the Λουκιανὸς or κοινή, and was adopted in the churches from Antioch to Constantinople.

Another was undertaken about the same time by Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop. As little is known of it as of the Lucian revision. Holmes supposes that he made use of the Hexaplar text.* According to Jerome, it was current in the churches of Egypt. He calls it *exemplar Alexandrinum.* Ernesti† thinks that neither Lucian nor Hesychius made use of the Hebrew text, but only the later Greek interpreters, and his opinion is adopted by Frankel. But Hody,‡ relying on ancient testimonies, thinks that they used both the other Greek versions and the Hebrew text, for the purpose of bringing the Septuagint nearer to the original Hebrew.

Syncellus also speaks of Basil bishop of Caesarea correcting the text of the Seventy.§ But this was not a *recension*, as Eichhorn supposed.‖ The words merely refer to his solicitude in having correct copies of the existing recensions of Origen, Lucian, and Hesychius.

So many different revisions of the text contributed little to its purity. Had they been kept distinct, they might have done so; but they were very soon mixed up together, so that they helped to introduce greater corruption into it than there was before Origen. Jerome complains of this confusion in various places. Accordingly the MSS. now existing do not exhibit the text in any one recension of it. They contain the old text before Origen, viz. the κοινή, the Hexaplar, the Lucian, and the Hesychian texts, but not *separately.* No MS. presents a single condition of the text. The recensions are presented in a mixed state in the copies.

The parts of the version where the text presents the great-

* Prefatio ad tom. i. Veteris Testamenti Graeci, sectio x.

† Dissertatio de Origene interpretationis librorum ss. grammaticae auctore, § 15.

‡ De textibus originalibus, &c. pp. 302-3, 626, et seq.

§ Chronographia, p. 203. ‖ Einleitung, vol. i. p. 508.

est departures from the Hebrew are in Exodus, Jeremiah, Esther, Daniel, Job, Proverbs.

In Exodus from chapter xxxvi. 8 till the end, and in parts of the next three chapters, there is great mutilation and confusion. It was so in the time of Origen, for he complained about it in his epistle to Julius Africanus, and endeavoured to apply a remedy in his Hexaplar edition.

In the case of Jeremiah, the arrangement of the prophecies is very different. Those uttered against foreign nations form the concluding part of the Hebrew copy, whereas in the Greek they occupy the middle, for they begin after chapter xxv. 14 of the Hebrew text and run through six chapters, so that the xxxii. of the version corresponds with xxv. 15-38 of the Hebrew.

The following tables shew the diversities between them :—

Hebrew.	*Greek.*
Chapter xlix. 34-39	xxv. 34-39.
xlvi. 2-12	xxvi. 1-11.
xlvi. 13-28	xxvi. 12-26.
l. li.	xxvii. xxviii.
xlvii. 1-7	xxix. 1-7.
xlix. 7-22	xxix. 7-22.
xlix. 1-6	xxx. 1-5.
xlix. 28-33	xxx. 6-11.
xlix. 23-27	xxx. 12-16.
xlviii. 1-44	xxxi.
45, &c.	wanting.
xxv. 15-38	xxxii.

The prophecies against the different nations are thus arranged in the two documents :—

Hebrew.	*Greek.*
1. Against Egypt	1. Against Elam.
2. ,, the Philistines	2. ,, Egypt.
3. ,, Moab	3. ,, Babylon.
4. ,, Ammon	4. ,, The Philistines.
5. ,, Edom	5. ,, Edom.
6. ,, Damascus	6. ,, Ammon.
7. ,, Kedar	7. ,, Kedar.
8. ,, Elam	8. ,, Damascus.
9. ,, Babylon	9. ,, Moab.

There are also omissions in and additions to the Greek text. The omissions relate not merely to single words and verses as i. 13; ii. 17, 19; iii. 1, 9, 10; v. 13, 15, 19; vii. 1, 2, 13, 21; viii. 4, 10, 13; ix. 12, 22, 25; xvi. 1, 5, 6; xvii. 5; xviii. 7, 17; xxv. 1; xxvii. 1, 3 (Hebrew l. 1, 3); but to whole passages such as viii. 10-12; xvii. 1-4; xxvii. 13, 14 (Greek xxxiv. 13, 14); xxvii. 19-22 (Greek xxxiv. 19, &c.); xxix. 13-21 (Greek xxxvi. 14-20); xxxiii. (Greek xl.) 14-26; xxxix. (Greek xlvi.) 4-13; xlviii. (Greek xxxi.) 45-47. Additions are found in ii. 28, 30, 31; iii. 17, 18; iv. 2, 26, 29; v. 1, 17; vii. 4, 10; xxvi. 15 (Hebrew xlvi. 15); xxxv. 10 (Hebrew xxviii. 10); xxxvi. 1, 8 (Hebrew xxix. 1, 8).*

As to the hypotheses concerning these discrepancies, they do not belong to our present purpose. Spohn, Eichhorn, Jahn, Movers, Ewald, Hitzig, De Wette, and especially Wichelhaus, have tried to account for the perplexing anomalies.

There are various additions to the book of Esther in this version, which Jerome in his Latin translation put at the end of the book. The principal are these:—

A dream of Mordecai, which stands at the commencement of the lxx, but in the Vulgate chapters xi. 1—xii. 6.

The edict of Haman, after chapter iii. 13. In the Vulgate xiii. 1-7.

A prayer of Mordecai and Esther, after iv. 17. In the Vulgate xiii. 8—xiv. 19.

An amplification of the scene between Esther and the King, v. 1, 2. In the Vulgate xv. 4-19.

Mordecai's edict mentioned in viii. 9. Septuagint viii. 12. Vulgate xvi. 1-24.

The interpretation of Mordecai's dream and the account of

* See Cappell's Critica Sacra, ed. Vogel and Scharfenberg, vol. ii. p. 704, et seq.; and Herbst's Einleitung, zweyter Theil, zweyte Abtheilung, p. 52, et seq.

the way in which the feast of Purim was made known in Egypt. Septuagint after x. 3. So too the Vulgate.*

These additions are obviously *apocryphal.*

In regard to Daniel, the chief additions in the Septuagint are *Azariah's prayer* and *the song of the three children* in the third chapter; the history of Susanna, chapter xiii., and Bel and the Dragon, chapter xiv. There are other minor additions, abbreviations and varieties, especially in chapters iii.-vi.†

The deviations from the Hebrew text which the version presents in Job and Proverbs are considerable when collected together, but not as they occur singly. They are such as may be attributed partly to the MSS. employed, and partly to the translators' caprice or ignorance.

The two principal MSS. of the Seventy are the Vatican and the Alexandrine. According to John Morin, the basis of the former is the κοινή. This opinion Holmes adopts only so far as the Pentateuch is concerned. But Masius and Grabe thought very differently. With regard to the Alexandrine MS. the basis of its text is the Hexaplar one, according to Montfaucon and Grabe. Holmes, however, considers it to present the text of the *tetrapla.*‡

Printed editions of the Septuagint represent the text in a worse state than the MSS., because they do not give *exactly* the particular MSS. from which they were taken. They may be reduced to four principal ones, whence all the rest have flowed.

1. The Complutensian edition contained in the Polyglott, 1514-1517.—This text, according to the editors, was derived from several MSS. Holmes says that three of them are extant still. On what authority Scholz § affirms that three MSS.

* See Eichhorn's Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des alten Testaments, p. 419, et seq. † De Wette's Einleit. p. 391.

‡ Praefatio ad Pentateuchum, caput ii.

§ Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften des alten und neuen Testaments, vol. i. p. 481.

now lost were used by the editors we cannot ascertain. He has probably mistaken what Holmes asserts. It has been suspected that the text was altered by the editors to bring it into agreement with the Hebrew. So Ussher, Walton, and Hody supposed. But the suspicion has not been verified. It rather agrees with Origen's Hexaplar text; for Bruns* and Norberg† have both shewn, that the Syriac-Hexaplar MS. at Milan frequently coincides with this edition. Hence the suspicion is unfounded, notwithstanding the attempt of Frankel‡ to revive it—an attempt in which he has wholly failed. The text of the Complutensian proceeded from Greek MSS. containing Origen's improved Hexaplar text.

2. The Aldine edition was published in folio, at Venice 1518. —This exhibits a text corrected according to the marks placed by Origen. Hence it contains additions from Theodotion and Aquila. Even the New Testament has furnished interpolations in it. The MSS. used by the editor Andreas Asulanus were probably not many and those representing the text found in the later Greek MSS.

3. The Roman edition, prepared by order of Pope Sixtus the Fifth, and published in 1587 folio, under the editorship of A. Carafa, A. Agelli, P. Morin, J. Ursin, R. Bellarmine.—The basis of it is the Vatican MS. It does not however give that text accurately; for several parts were altered under the mistaken impression that they contained the errors of transcribers. In others the orthography was changed. The important gaps of the MS. were also supplied from other codices.

4. The edition of Grabe, published at Oxford, in four volumes folio, the second and third edited by Lee and Wigan after Grabe's death, and also large octavo, 1707-1720.—The text is that of the Alexandrine MS. It does not however adhere to

* In Eichhorn's Repertorium, Theil iii. p. 174 and Theil viii. p. 109.

† In Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur, Theil i. p. 851.

‡ Vorstudien u. s. w. p. 243, note.

it in all cases. Suspicious readings in the Alexandrine MS. are sometimes rejected. This edition was reprinted by J. J. Breitinger in four volumes 4to at Zurich, 1730-32. The editor appended the various readings of the Roman edition and three MSS.

The best edition representing the Vatican text is that which was begun by Dr. Holmes, who published the Pentateuch at Oxford, 1798 folio. After his death it was continued by Parsons, and completed in other four volumes, the last appearing in 1827. This is the most complete edition, and the most important of all yet published. It contains the text of the Roman edition, with various readings from many MSS., from the fathers, from versions, and from five printed editions. Citations are given from the uncial MSS. marked i. to xiii. and cursive ones from 14-311. But eight are given twice, so that the entire number is so much the less. The materials collected might have been more clearly and distinctly exhibited. Readings even of important MSS. such as the Alexandrine, are imperfectly given.* It is matter of regret that the Vatican MS. was collated only *in part* for this edition.

The mass of readings collected by Holmes shews that it is hardly possible to restore the original text of the Seventy. It confirms the opinion formerly entertained, that the text is incurably corrupt. Materials may be accumulated; but they are all too recent to shew the authentic κοινὴ text.

Holmes's edition, it will be observed, is not a critical one. It does not give a critically revised text. It is merely a storehouse of materials for such an edition. No critical text has yet been given.

A very convenient manual edition was published by Tis-

* "Vellem indicasse Holmes, utrum ipse denuo hunc codicem (Alexandrinum) contulerit. Quod si neglexit, id profecto multum de hujus operis pretio detrahit." See Amersfoordt, Dissertatio Philolog. de variis lectionibus Holmesianis, p. 136.

chendorf at Leipzig, in two volumes 8vo, 1850. The text is the Vatican. The value of the edition consists in the readings taken from the cod. Ephraeimi, the text of which Tischendorf first published; and from the cod. Friderico-Augustanus also published by him. In addition to these he has given the readings of the cod. Alexandrinus.

The proper Alexandrine version of Daniel was first published from a MS. in the library of Cardinal Chigi at Rome in 1772, folio. It was subsequently reprinted at Göttingen and Leyden, and is given in the portable edition of the Messrs. Bagster lately published.

A beautifully printed manual edition in one octavo volume has been published since Tischendorf's by Bagsters of London. It is to be followed by a selection of various readings.

The versions made from the Septuagint are the old Latin version, the Syriac-Hexaplar, the Æthiopic, the Gothic, the two Egyptian translations, viz. the Coptic or Memphitic and Sahidic or Thebaic, the Armenian, the Georgian, and several Arabic versions. The Slavonic, which has been usually considered a daughter of the Greek, was made from the old Italic in the Glagolitic letters according to Alter, and altered after Greek MSS. about the fourteenth century. But Dobrovsky adheres to the common opinion.

By means of the Syriac-Hexaplar it is probable that the Hexaplar text may be well known, as various books of it are now in the British Museum which were obtained in addition to other treasures, from the Nitrian monasteries. It is likely that with the books already printed from the Milan MS. all are extant.

CHAPTER XIII.

GREEK VERSIONS OF AQUILA, THEODOTION, SYMMACHUS, &c. &c.

AQUILA.

AQUILA was a Jewish proselyte born at Synope in Pontus, who translated the books of the Old Testament into Greek for the purpose, it is supposed, of assisting the Hellenistic Jews in their controversies with the Christians. He has been accused by the fathers of misinterpreting some prophecies relating to the Messiah. But little weight can be attached to their accusations, because they were ignorant of Hebrew. The most they could do was to compare Aquila with the Seventy and note the agreement or disagreement; but this was insufficient to shew that he had perverted the original text. It is needless therefore to dwell on the unfavourable opinion entertained of him by Irenaeus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Philastrius, and others. Jerome could find no trace of falsification in his version, and even applies various commendatory epithets to him.* It is true that in one epistle he applies to him the epithet *contentiosus*;† but in another he denies that he is such.‡ In modern times Kennicott has repeated the charge, mainly

* See his Comment. in Hosea ii.; Epist. 138 ad Marcell.; in Esai. xlix.

† Epist. ad Pammach. de optimo genere interpret.

‡ Epist. 125 ad Damas.

relying on the fathers.* But one of his chief witnesses, Justin Martyr, does not quote Aquila at all; and any proof extracted out of others is absolutely worthless.

It would appear from Jerome, that he made two editions, the cause of which was his anxiety to render his version as literal as he could; for he found that in the first edition, though generally adhering to the Hebrew words, some expressions were used which he afterwards thought too paraphrastic. The second edition was therefore more literal than the first. Whether it extended to the entire Old Testament or not, it is impossible to determine. We know that it embraced Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel.

This version was highly esteemed by the Jews and preferred to all others. They called it *the Hebrew verity.* It is extremely literal, keeping as closely as possible by the original contrary to the idiom of the Greek language. Accordingly Aquila renders the Hebrew particle אֵת by σὺν in the first chapter of Genesis. Jerome says—"Non solum verba, sed etymologias verborum quoque transferre conatus est. Quis enim pro *frumento* et *vino* et *oleo* posset vel legere vel intelligere χεῦμα, ὀπωρισμὸν, στιλπνότητα, quod nos possumus dicere *fusionem*, *pomationem* et *splendentiam?* Aut quia Hebraici non solum habent ἄρθρα set et πρόαρθρα, ille κακοζήλως et syllabas interpretatur et litteras, dicitque σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν, quod Graeca et latina lingua omnino non recipit."†

The great *critical* value of this version lies in its slavish literality. By means of it, we are sometimes able to shew that certain readings of the Masoretic text apparently condemned by other translators are of great antiquity, and preferable to such as probably originated in a paraphrastic mode of translation.

Aquila belonged to the second century; but to what part

* See Dissertatio generalis, ed. Bruns, p. 147, et seq.

† In Esai. xlix.

of it can only be approximated. He is mentioned by Irenaeus* (177-192), which would bring him probably to *the middle* or more of the second century. If however it be true, as that father says, that he was a disciple of Rabbi Akiba, he belongs to the first half of the century, to the time of Adrian 117-138; for Akiba was put to death at the command of Adrian. This agrees with the accounts of Epiphanius, who says he was a relative of Adrian;† and with notices in various Jewish books.

The Jerusalem Talmud often speaks of this version and cites it.‡ But the Babylonian confounds him in one place with Onkelos. It has also been conjectured that Irenaeus is guilty of the same interchange, because Rabbi Asaria in his work entitled *Meor Enayim* quotes various passages from the version of Aquila which do not bear the character of literality.§ But it is better to abide by the testimony of Irenaeus in the second century, than that of a Jewish writer in the sixteenth. The passages quoted by the latter were probably taken from a *Midrash*, as Herbst supposes,‖ and falsely ascribed to the celebrated translator Aquila. It is totally improbable that the Aquila of the Jerusalem Talmud was different from the Aquila of Irenaeus, making *two* men of the same name who rendered the Old Testament into Greek, as Eichhorn supposes.¶

THEODOTION.

Theodotion was a native of Ephesus, according to Irenaeus, and is called by Jerome and Eusebius an Ebionite, or semi-christian. He is the second who composed a Greek version. If we receive the testimony of those who had the version in their hands, it approached the Septuagint very nearly in sense

* Advers. Haeres. iii. 24. † De Ponder. et mensur. c. 15.

‡ Shabbath, fol. 8, 2; Yoma, fol. 41, 1; Megill, fol. 73, 2; Succah fol. 54, 4. § P. 146, b. ‖ Einleitung, vol. i. p. 157.

¶ Einleit. vol. ii. §§ 221, 222, p. 34, et seq.

and phraseology. The mode of translation adopted by him holds an intermediate place between the scrupulous literality of Aquila and the free interpretation of Symmachus. The translator appears indeed to have made the Alexandrine version the basis of his own; and to have abided by it as long as it represents the Hebrew faithfully; departing from it and freely translating for himself *only* where it inadequately expressed the sense of the original. His object was rather to supply the defects of that version, than to give a new and independent one. Hence the additions found only in the former reappear in his work. From the remaining fragments it may be inferred that his knowledge of Hebrew was not great. He has retained Hebrew words not very difficult or obscure, expressing them in Greek letters from ignorance of their meaning.* But Jahn conjectures that they were used among the Ebionites, and therefore retained by him;† a supposition as improbable as that of Prideaux and Owen, viz., that they were left so for particular reasons, such as the honour of the Jewish nation.‡

The version was in higher estimation among Christians than those of Aquila and Symmachus; and the book of Daniel was taken from it in place of the Septuagint version. Origen in his Hexapla supplied the omissions of the Seventy chiefly from it.

As Theodotion is mentioned by Irenaeus, he must have lived before A.D. 176. And if there be allusions to him in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, as Stroth§ thinks, he must have made his version before 160.

* "Praeter alia minus docti interpretis signa, quae erudito lectori exploranda remittimus, persaepe ille verba hebraica, quorum interpretatio non ita difficilis erat ut vertendi molestiam declinaret, graecis litteris expressit."—Montfaucon, Praeliminaria, vii. 3, p. 129, ed. Bahrdt.

† Einleitung, vol. i. pp. 178, 179.

‡ Owen, Enquiry into the present state of the Sept. version, p. 108.

§ Repertorium, ii. p. 76.

A passage in Jerome apparently favours the idea of a second edition.* But Hody conjectured that it is corrupt. †

SYMMACHUS.

The third Greek version proceeded from Symmachus, who is said to have been a Samaritan by birth. Eusebius and Jerome represent him as an Ebionite; and this is confirmed by Syrian accounts. The old writers who mention this version observe, that the author translated freely and laboured to give the sense rather than the words. He does not adhere to the text so closely as to render it verbatim into Greek; but chooses to express the sense in perspicuous and intelligible language. But it was not pure or elegant, as is often said, if we may judge from the fragments that remain. It contains the usual Hellenistic phraseology, very like that of the Seventy. There was a second edition of it, as we learn from Jerome. ‡ But whether it extended to the entire Old Testament is uncertain. It may have been purer and more elegant than the first, as Eichhorn supposes. The time when Symmachus made his version cannot be accurately fixed. It is certain that it appeared after Theodotion's (177); for Irenaeus makes no mention of him, which he would probably have done had his version been published.

There can be little doubt that all the three translations were better executed than the Septuagint. They were more faithful to the original, and avoided the resolution of tropes, which is so common in the Alexandrine one. And they often agree in opposition to it.

The remaining fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and

* "Theodotio interpretatus est *sudrinas;* secunda *pessima;* Symmachus *novissimas.*"—In Jerem. xxix. 17.

† De Bibliorum textibus, &c. p. 584.

‡ On Jeremiah xxxii.; Nahum iii.

Theodotion were collected by Montfaucon in the work already noticed; and are found of course in Bahrdt's reprint. A specimen of the three may therefore be sought in the latter work, which is very accessible.

When Origen travelled into eastern countries collecting materials for his Polyglott, he discovered three other Greek versions made by unknown authors, and of an unknown age. Judging by the fragments of them in Montfaucon, they appear to have embraced some, not all books of the Old Testament, and are usually called the fifth, sixth, and seventh, from the columns they occupied in Origen's work. Hence in the Hexaplar fragments they are marked with the letters ε, ς, ζ.

The accounts given of the three in ancient writers are uncertain and contradictory. Epiphanius says, the fifth was found at Jericho; but Jerome, that it was found at Nicopolis on the Actian shore. Epiphanius makes the sixth to be found at Nicopolis. According to Eusebius, one was found at Jericho and one at Nicopolis; but it is not said which. The truth seems to be that the fifth was found at Nicopolis, the sixth at Jericho.* The fifth is supposed to have contained the Pentateuch, minor prophets, Psalms, Solomon's Song, as all the fragments collected by Montfaucon refer to no other books. Yet there is reason to believe that it also extended to Kings. The words of Jerome too favour the opinion that it had Job and Proverbs;† though Jerome may have been mistaken in this.

The sixth contained the same books as the fifth, with the exception of the Kings. It has been inferred from one fragment that the author was a Christian, viz., Habak. iii. 13, where the translation runs thus: ἐξῆλθες τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν λαόν

* See Carpzov, Critica Sacra, p. 371, et seq.

† "Nonnulli vero libri, et maxime hi qui apud Hebraeos versu compositi sunt, tres alias editiones additas habent: quam quintam et sextam et septimam translationem vocant," &c.—Comment. in epist. ad Titum.

σου διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. But Jerome calls the translators of the fifth and sixth *Judaicos*, which may either be a mistake on his part, or else the translator was a Jewish Christian; or the passage quoted may be *a Christian gloss.*

The seventh version contained the Psalms, according to Eusebius,* and the minor prophets. The words of Jerome seem to imply that it extended, as well as the fifth and sixth, to Proverbs and Job. The fewest fragments of it remain. Probably the author was a Jew.

It is likely that all three were made after Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus had executed theirs; and that the authors made use of existing versions. The Hebrew original however was consulted.

In addition to the Hexaplar fragments already noticed, others have been found in the margin of MSS., indicating the existence of Greek versions distinct from the preceding ones. Thus we meet with fragments under the appellations ὁ Ἑβραῖος, ὁ Σύρος, τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν, ὁ Ἑλληνικός.

According to Semler,† ὁ Ἑβραῖος means Aquila. But this appears to be incorrect. The title rather refers to the Hebrew text, *i.e.*, remarks of the fathers that a passage should be translated in such and such a way after the Hebrew text. Most fragments of ὁ Ἑβραῖος have been drawn from Jerome's commentaries, shewing that in comparing the Septuagint with the Hebrew, he often had occasion to amend it according to the latter. Hence his improvements are introduced into the Hexapla with the title of ὁ Ἑβραῖος.

ὁ Σύρος is thought to mean fragments of Jerome's Latin translation out of the Hebrew rendered into Greek by Sophronius. This is inferred from the agreement of many fragments so quoted with Jerome's Latin version; from the fact that no trace of ὁ Σύρος appears before Jerome; that Theodore of Mopsuestia in a passage preserved by Photius calls Jerome

* H. E. vi. 16. † Hermeneut. Vorbereitungen, p. 421.

Aram, *i.e.*, the Syrian, either because he lived for a long time on the confines of Syria, or because the Greek edition of his Hebrew-Latin version had obtained currency among the Syrians. But all this is very questionable, because ὁ Σύρος frequently appears in the Pentateuch; and we know that the Psalms and prophets alone were translated by Sophronius out of Jerome's Latin into Greek. Nor is the agreement of ὁ Σύρος with Jerome uniform or great. In regard to the title Ἀραμ used by Theodore, it cannot mean the *Aramaean* or *Syrian*. It should have been ὁ Ἀραμαῖος.*

The true meaning of the phrase is the Syriac version, quoted in the same way by Diodorus of Tarsus, Eusebius, and Theodoret. Τὸ Σαμαρειτικὸν is either extracts from the Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch as Herbst supposes;† or extracts out of a Greek version made from the Samaritan.‡ Ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς is an unknown Greek translation.

THE VENETIAN-GREEK VERSION.

A MS. exists in the library of St. Mark's at Venice containing a Greek version of various books in the Old Testament, viz. the Pentateuch, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and Daniel.

The internal character of this version shews that it was made directly from the Hebrew. It is slavishly literal, word for word of the original being rendered into Attic Greek. In the Chaldee sections of Daniel the Doric is used. As it is impossible to adhere with rigid exactness to the words of the original and at the same time present the elegancies of the Attic Greek, it is obvious that gross barbarisms must pervade the diction. Although therefore the translator was intent on Attic elegancies and high-sounding words used by the best

* See Herbst's Einleit. vol. i. pp. 161, 162. † Ibid, p. 191.
‡ See De Wette, Einleit. § 63, b. p. 98.

Greek writers, his version is peculiarly barbarous. Thus in Proverbs iii. 3, we meet with such words as γαργαρεὼν ὀρρωδέω; in iii. 32 οὐσιωτὴς; in ii. 18 βοθροῦν. The *Masoretic* text lies at the basis of it. No important readings have been discovered in it which are not in existing Masoretic MSS., nor any peculiar to it which are preferable to the common text. Like the modern MSS., the translator's text agrees sometimes with the *K'ri*, sometimes with the *c'thib*. It would seem however, that the MS. he used was not divided throughout, like our modern copies, by accents, nor furnished throughout with the present vowel system; since there are many departures from the accents and vowel points. In the preparation of his work the author consulted the Septuagint and other Greek translations, and even Jewish expositors.

It is impossible to tell the time when it was made or the person from whom it proceeded. The MS. in St. Mark's belongs to the fourteenth century; but it appears to have been copied from another much older. The version must be placed after the ninth century; and it is likely that it was made by a Jew at Byzantium, apparently for private use. As it is, its value is little. Criticism can derive small benefit from it. When it is sometimes said that extracts from it were inserted by Holmes in his edition of the Septuagint, there appears to be an error, as Holmes nowhere mentions it.

The Pentateuch was edited by Ammon in three octavo parts or volumes, at Erlangen, 1790, 1791; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Daniel, by John Casp. d'Ansse de Villoison in one volume 8vo, 1784, at Strasburgh.

CHAPTER XIV.

TARGUMS.

THE origin of Chaldee paraphrases or versions is somewhat obscure. It has been mixed up with disputed points, such as the authenticity of certain books, and therefore different views of it have been entertained. The extinction of Hebrew as a living language, with which the rise of these translations is necessarily connected, has also been variously determined in relation to *time*, a circumstance which must affect the view taken of them. It is not likely that the Hebrew language ceased to be spoken after the Jews had returned from exile. Doubtless they had largely forgotten it in Babylon. Tenacious as they were of their national peculiarities, they had become accustomed to the Chaldee. The common people to a great extent had adopted it. The lower and less educated class had laid aside the use of their mother tongue in part, as was natural in the circumstances. They spoke Chaldee more frequently than Hebrew, and understood it better. It was the language of their every-day life in the land of their exile. But the more cultivated class read and spoke Hebrew still. The old tongue continued to be the language of books; the other pervaded more their ordinary conversation. After returning to their own land the two continued side by side,—the Hebrew gradually verging towards total disuse, till in the second century before Christ it was wholly supplanted.

If this view be correct, we need not minutely examine two

passages which have been explained differently both by older and by modern scholars. From them Gesenius and De Wette extract another sense than Hengstenberg and Hävernick. There must be difficulty therefore in coming to a proper conclusion; and we would gladly be relieved from the alternative of pronouncing one or other wrong. The two passages which have been drawn into the question before us in an indirect way are Nehem. xiii. 24, and viii. 8. The former, according to Gesenius and De Wette, shews that the Jewish language was *not* lost during the Babylonish captivity;* though Hengstenberg,† assigning to the phrase *the Jews' language* the meaning of *Aramaean language*, maintains its perfect harmony with the opposite opinion. The latter passage, according to the same lexicographer,‡ means that the Priests and Levites read in the law of God *word for word*, *faithfully*, *exactly*, with such explanations of what was difficult as served to make it intelligible, *all in the same language;* while the older interpreters (whom Hengstenberg and Hävernick follow) think that the passage contains the idea of a Chaldee version which accompanied the law thus publicly read to the people. Here every thing turns on the right sense of the term מְפֹרָשׁ, which Gesenius understands to mean *word for word*, *faithfully*, *literally;* but those who are opposed to him, *illustrated*, *made manifest* (*i.e.* by an accompanying version). Perhaps the passages are rightly explained by Gesenius. Perhaps it is implied in Nehem. xiii. 2, 4, that *the Hebrew* was still spoken, though by no means *exclusively*. Probably also it is *not* involved in Nehem. viii. 8, that a Chaldee paraphrase was uttered in the hearing of the people when the law was read before them. We hesitate here to accept

* Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, p. 44, et seq.; and De Wette's Einleit. § 34.

† Beiträge zur Einleit. ins alte Testament, p. 299, et seq.

‡ Geschichte, u. s. w. p. 44.

the interpretations of Hengstenberg and Hävernick who are too ready to revert to old opinions, when such men as Gesenius and De Wette have discarded them. But though the necessity for a Chaldee oral version was not felt so early as the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, it became more urgent as years rolled on. The Chaldee was encroaching on the Hebrew. It was acquiring the ascendency over it. It is likely that soon after Ezra a few oral explanations in Chaldee were added by the public interpreter* to the Sabbath lessons taken from the law and prophets. The Hebrew Scriptures were accompanied by occasional glosses or paraphrases in Chaldee. In process of time the custom of extempore comment seems to have been abused. Hence the oldest parts of the Talmud contain strict injunctions respecting public interpretations of the law. Definite hermeneutic rules are laid down, in conformity with which the interpretation was to be conducted. It is easy to perceive how the value of *written* expositions would become apparent, when the freedom of the interpreter began to be abridged. *Oral* gave rise to *written* explanations, the necessity for the latter presenting itself the more strongly when the extempore translator was not allowed free scope. It was gradually perceived that the surest and best method of giving the meaning was by a regular and written version. Of course the written interpretation was not to be read in the synagogues; for that was forbidden, as we learn from Maimonides. It was for the private use of the interpreter himself, and the pious in general.

External circumstances in the second century before Christ were also favourable to the production of *written* explanations. Hellenistic Jews were already in possession of the law in their own tongue. Hence it was natural for the Aramaean-speaking

* According to Maimonides the office of interpreter (methurgeman) was distinct from that of reader. "A diebus Esdrae consueverunt habere interpretem qui populo id interpretaretur quod lector ex lege perlegit, ut sensum verborum intelligeret." Hilc. Tephil. cap. xii.

Jews to seek a version of the Scriptures in their own dialect. The necessity of it would be felt a century before Christ, probably not much sooner; inasmuch as oral explanations had prevailed during the preceding century and in some measure supplied its place up to a given period. Hence we are inclined to date the origin of Chaldee paraphrases or *written* translations *before* Christ's appearance, provided there be nothing in history opposed to that view. If history corroborates it, the opinion seems all but certain.

But here it must not be thought, that the earliest written Chaldee paraphrases which we now have consisted of these oral explanations traditionally handed down. They are not the same put into writing. Neither do they appear to have been made up of Chaldee glosses, scholia, explanations of unusual words, or of separate verses and paragraphs written in the margin of MSS. and enlarged by degrees, which the first paraphrasts Jonathan and Onkelos took and digested into one body, so making their translations. Their evenness of style, their uniformity of spirit and diction, as Carpzov long ago remarked, are adverse to this hypothesis. We cannot believe that the works of Onkelos and Jonathan were either the written copies of oral interpretations before prevalent, as some have thought; or that they were made up of glosses and notes. That several of the current oral expositions in Chaldee were adopted by the translators, is probable enough. That Chaldee words which had been already used to make the Hebrew intelligible were taken, is almost certain. But the versions were not transcripts of traditional interpretations. They were independent in their origin.

The name *Targum* is now appropriated to a *Chaldee* version; but the oriental Jews called every translation from one language into another a תַּרְגּוּם, *targum*, *interpretation* or *version*.

There are many Jewish traditions respecting Targums in

early times. Thus in various parts of the Talmud there is mention of one on Job, in the middle of the first century; and it is not likely that Job was the first book rendered into the language of the people. There are also allusions to older Targums, whence Zunz infers that there were written Aramaean versions of most books of the Old Testament in the time of the Maccabees.* But Jewish traditions regarding these Targums should be received with caution. Discrimination must be exercised in adopting them; for it is well known how prone the Talmudists were to carry up the origin of many things much higher than we can now believe.

But while the Jews are disposed to find Targums too early, some Christian writers have gone to the opposite extreme. Thus Havemann † assigned the earliest of them to the sixth century and to Chaldea. So too Vorstius, John Morin, and Eichhorn reduce them to a late date; relying mainly on the arguments adduced by Havemann. But their reasons were well answered by Pfeiffer, Wolf, Carpzov, Jahn, and others. The silence of the early fathers respecting these paraphrases is of little weight against their existence, because the fathers generally were ignorant of Hebrew and Hebrew literature. And then no importance was attached to them in comparison of Greek translations. It is somewhat remarkable, that the silence of Josephus should be used as an argument against their existence in his day; and that Zunz ‡ on the other hand should judge that the historian made use of Targums.

We believe that the oldest Targums extant must be dated as early at least as the birth of Christ; but whether others preceded them which are now lost, must be left undetermined. We incline to the opinion that there were such a century before the Christian era, not in Palestine, but among the Babylonian

* Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, pp. 61, 62.

† Wegeleuchte wieder die Jüdische Finsternissen, cap. v. p. 594.

‡ Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, p. 62.

Jews. The latter would have them before the Palestinian Jews. They would require them sooner. They lost the Hebrew before their brethren in Palestine.

ONKELOS.

There is a Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch which has always been highly valued by the Jews. In regard to the author, the notices of him are meagre and uncertain. He is mentioned four times in the Babylonian Talmud. In the *Megilla*, fol. 3, 1, he appears to be confounded with Aquila the Greek translator, because what is there stated is applied in the Jerusalem *Megilla*, fol. 71, 3, to Aquila. In *Bab. Demai Tosaphta*, c. 5, he is also confounded with Aquila, as we learn from comparison of the Jerusalem *Demai*, fol. 25, 4. In *Avoda Sara*, fol. 11, 1, Onkelos, the son of Kalonymus and nephew of Titus, is also the same as Aquila, if what Epiphanius relates of the latter be true. According to *Avoda Sara*, fol. 11, 1, he was a friend of Gamaliel. But there is some reason for suspecting that the Onkelos here spoken of is the same as the Onkelos (Aquila) in other places of the Talmud. In the book *Sohar*, he is represented as a disciple of Hillel and Shammai. It is evident from all these notices, that the Babylonians had no certain knowledge of the time when he lived.

It has been inferred that he was a Babylonian from the purity of the Chaldee in his version; the Chaldee or Aramaean of Palestine being thought less pure than the Babylonian. This however is by no means certain. In the absence of Palestinian-Chaldee documents of the same age with which to compare Onkelos's Targum, little weight can be attached to that circumstance. It has also been inferred by Eichhorn and Bertholdt, from the silence of Origen and Jerome about Onkelos and his version, that it was known to the Babylonian Jews only, for a long time. But the Jerusalem Gemarists

may have had no occasion to speak of it; and the two fathers had to do with the original text and *Greek versions*, whenever they were occupied with biblical literature.

The diction of this Targum is pure, approaching that of Daniel and Ezra. The original is followed word for word, faithfully and literally. The author possessed an exact knowledge of the Hebrew language, and has been very happy in rendering not only all passages which might present some difficulty to less competent translators, but also in transferring into another tongue rare words and singular constructions. He deserves therefore the praise bestowed on him by the Jews, for his version is among the best and most valuable of ancient times.

The title *paraphrase* given to the version before us scarcely suits its character, since the author adhered so faithfully to the original words. But he did not bind himself to literality so slavishly as not to depart from it where the sense required some freedom. Indeed *the sense* was his chief concern. He has deviated from the letter occasionally by altering *the expression* without altering the meaning, for the purpose of resolving tropical expressions, as in Gen. xv. 4, where the words בַּר דְּתוֹלִיד, *the son whom thou shalt beget*, are put for יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ; of illustrating the expression, as in Exodus xxix. 35, where תְּקָרֵיב קוּרְבָּנְהוֹן, *thou shalt offer their offerings*, stands for תְּמַלֵּא יָדָם, *thou shalt fill their hand;* for the purpose of avoiding every thing which might appear to lower the divine Majesty or excite heathen notions respecting Him, as in Gen. xi. 5, where וְאִתְגְּלֵי and (Jehovah) *appeared*, stands for וַיֵּרֶד, *and he descended.* So too יְהוָה is used for אֱלֹהִים. Deviations from literality are also exemplified in *alterations* of the expression and sense, in *paraphrases* of the expression and sense. In one case only, viz. Gen. xlix. has Onkelos abandoned his method of translation, and fallen into loose paraphrase. Occasionally there are not only paraphrases but

additions, for which no corresponding clause appears in the original, as in Gen. iii. 15, xxii. 14; Exod. xx. 5; Numb. vi. 27.

From the preceding remarks it will be seen, that while the translator follows the Hebrew text, for the most part word for word, he does not adhere to it closely *in all cases.* Hence we cannot always determine the readings he had in the MS. before him. The text his version was made from approached very near the present Masoretic one. Wherever it deviates from the Masoretic text, it is generally supported by other versions.

The work is useful in criticism chiefly in consequence of its literal character. It is as useful however in *interpretation;* for that was the translator's leading object. Among the Jews, this Targum was used as a sort of dictionary for the significations of Hebrew words; and they composed a Masorah upon it called *Masorah Hattargum,* which however did not prevent various readings in it.

The principal editions of it are that of Bologna, accompanied with the Hebrew text, 1482; that of 1490; of Lisbon, 1491; another without date or place; that of Constantinople, 1505; the Complutensian, reprinted in the Antwerp Polyglott; the edition inserted by Bomberg in his Rabbinical Bibles, 1518, 1525-1526, 1547-1549. Buxtorf took it from Bomberg's Bible, and inserted it in his Rabbinical Bible; from which it was taken into the Paris and London Polyglotts. A Latin translation of it, with learned annotations, was published by Fagi at Strasburgh, 1546, folio. The most important contribution to the criticism of the text is that of S. D. Luzzatto, a learned Jew of Padua, in a work published at Vienna, 1830. The Latin title is *Philoxenus,* sive de Onkelosi chaldaica Pentateuchi versione dissertatio hermeneutico-critica, in qua veteris paraphrastae a textu hebraico crebrae deflexiones in xxxiii classes distribuuntur, et lucido novoque ordine illustrantur; atque cccl. in locis variae ejusdem versiones lectiones

perpenduntur, et ex antiquioribus et rarioribus editionibus, codicibusque emendantur. Accedit appendix, etc. etc.

JONATHAN.

The second Targum contains *the prophets*, *i.e.* Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets. It is ascribed to Jonathan son of Uzziel. According to the Talmudic accounts, this Jonathan was a disciple of Hillel the elder, and therefore he lived and wrote a little before Onkelos. The reputation of his work among the Jews is evinced by the tradition that he wrote it from the mouth of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

But this age ascribed to Jonathan has been controverted, as was that of Onkelos, partly with the same arguments, and partly with additional ones. We have seen that the silence of the Jerusalem Gemara and early fathers proves nothing against the early existence of a Targum. It has also been argued, that Jonathan seeks to explain away the Messiah out of the passages which Christians were accustomed to apply to him, shewing a polemic tendency, and consequently the later period when controversies between Jews and Christians were agitated; and that fables are incorporated with his version, which savour of later times.* But in the 53d chapter of Isaiah, to which Eichhorn after Carpzov appeals, the Messiah appears in Jonathan's version. In the 10th and 11th verses, he is arbitrarily introduced by name. And in the case of the 63d chapter, there is no proof that it was a classical Messianic chapter among the early Christians. On the contrary, almost all Messianic passages are explained of the Messiah. Thus in ix. 6 the son is expressly called *Messiah*; in lii. 13, to *my servant* is added *Messiah*; in the 11th chapter *the Messiah* is also found. So too in the 42d chapter. In like manner, *the*

* Eichhorn, Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 63.

righteous branch, Jerem. xxiii. 5, is referred to Messiah. Hence Gesenius is undoubtedly right in denying a polemical tendency on the part of Jonathan against the Christians.*

In regard to the fabulous legends which appear in the Targum and the references to later occurrences, it is likely that they are subsequent interpolations, a supposition confirmed by the fact that several of them are wanting in the text as printed in the Antwerp Polyglott.†

Jonathan is more of the *interpreter* and *paraphrast* than Onkelos. He allowed himself greater freedom in putting additions for which there are no corresponding words in Hebrew. But the Pentateuch was more sacred in the eyes of the Jews than any other part of Scripture. Stricter injunctions were laid on the interpreter of it. The people were better acquainted with it from childhood; it was more exact and intelligible. With the prophetic writings it was different. They were more obscure. They presented peculiarities which rendered them more difficult of apprehension. Their poetical diction, their references to uncommon objects, made them less easy to be understood by all. Hence Jonathan *resolves* tropes, or strives to make them plain by inserting several words, as in Isaiah i. 8, 21; alters the expression and sense where the honour of Deity or of his nation seemed to be affected, as in Isaiah i. 18, vi. 1; introduces later Jewish ideas, Rabbinical sayings, and the Jewish theology of his age, as in Isaiah i. 15, v. 10. It cannot be denied that his interpretation is often arbitrary and incorrect; or that absurd explanations appear here and there. In general however he translates literally and faithfully where the text does not require paraphrase. Though several Greek words, but in connections where they are appropriate, appear in the version before us, the style is pure, and the diction good, somewhat inferior indeed to that of Onkelos, but yet approaching to the biblical Chaldee.

* Commentar ueber den Jesaia, vol. i. p. 67. † Ibid, p. 68.

In the historical books, it is, as was to be expected, more literal than in the prophets properly so called. Hence some have looked upon the work as proceeding from at least two persons. But there is no good reason for this assumption. The prophets are much more difficult than the historical books, and require freer paraphrase.

The text lying at the basis of the Targum is the Masoretic one. Yet it differs from the Masoretic text in various places, where it appears to follow preferable readings. But the freedom which the translator took, makes it difficult to tell in every case what particular form of the text lay before him. Hence great caution must be used in applying the Targum to critical purposes. Because of its freer and more paraphrastic manner, it is of less value in a critical respect than that of Onkelos. Perhaps its *exegetical* value too is not so great. Still it must be remembered that Jonathan had a far more difficult task than Onkelos; and that his version has suffered here and there from interpolators.

The first half of the version was printed for the first time at Leiria in Portugal, accompanied by the Hebrew text and two Rabbinical commentaries, 1494, folio. It was afterwards printed entire in the Rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf; whence it was transferred to the London Polyglott. The minor prophets appeared in separate parts at different times and places; at Paris by Robert Stephens 1546; at the same place by Mercer 1552, 1557; at Helmstadt 1702, reprinted at Göttingen, &c. 1775, under the care of J. D. Michaelis.

PSEUDO-JONATHAN.

A Targum on the Pentateuch was formerly ascribed to the same Jonathan who translated the prophets, on what grounds it is difficult to imagine. It is possible that the son of Uzziel may have made a Chaldee paraphrase of the law as well as the

prophets; but it is indubitable that the existing one does not belong to him, because the author used that of Onkelos, whereas Jonathan Ben Uzziel was before Onkelos; because the language is impure and barbarous, mixed with foreign terms, Persian, Greek, and Latin; because it contains a number of fables, legends, and allegories of later growth and very absurd, unlike the manner of the real Jonathan; because objects centuries after the son of Uzziel are mentioned, such as Constantinople, a name Byzantium did not receive till the fourth century (Numb. xxiv. 19), the Lombards (Numb. xxiv. 24), the Turks (Gen. x. 2); because the learned Jews of the middle ages and afterwards mention no Targum on the Pentateuch, except that of Onkelos.

These and other circumstances shew that it could not have been written till the seventh century; to the latter half of which Zunz assigns it.

The prevalent ideas of the time are embodied in this Targum, and they savour of a late period. Manifestly Jonathan did not think them out for himself; they are the traditional notions of his day which are arbitrarily introduced as allegorical additions to adorn the paraphrase. The writer's object was not merely to explain the Mosaic books, but also to introduce a number of other subjects more or less remotely related to passages in the Bible; to embody many of the floating ideas of the age; and give permanency to a kind of literature which belonged to it. Hence the profuseness of his paraphrasing propensity; his long additions and comments. Criticism can derive very little, if any advantage, from the work, because the Masoretic text had been fixed long before. Wherever the Masoretes depart from the text, the paraphrase follows the *K'ri*, with one or two exceptions. Yet it agrees with the Septuagint and Samaritan in Gen. ii. 24, iv. 8, xxii. 13, and other places.* Nor is its exegetical use worth mentioning.

* See Petermann, De duabus Pentateuchi paraphrasibus Chaldaicis, p. 22, et seq.

The paraphrase was first printed at Venice 1590, 8vo, by Joh. de Gara, with a preface by R. Ascher Phorins, along with the Hebrew text, the two other Targums on the same books, the commentary of Rashi, and other Targums; and the edition was repeated in 1594, 8vo. It was afterwards published at Basel 1607, fol.; at Hanau 1614, 8vo; at Amsterdam 1640, 4to; at Prague 1646, 8vo; and in the fourth volume of the London Polyglott.

THE JERUSALEM TARGUM.

This paraphrase on the Pentateuch is called the Jerusalem Targum, either because it was made at Jerusalem, or from its being in the dialect of that place. It is neither a complete nor an independent work. Chapters are occasionally omitted; and an entire series of explanations is sometimes attached to a single word or verse. Sometimes Hebrew words are inserted without explanation. The paraphrase indeed consists of nothing more than loose comments on select passages. The language of it is very barbarous. Numerous foreign terms, Persian, Greek, Latin, are mixed together. Stories and fables are abundant.

It is evident that there is a close agreement between Pseudo-Jonathan and this Targum. Indeed, the former existed at an early period under the name of the *Targum of Palestine* or *Jerusalem.* Thus the Pseudo-Jonathan is identified with the present work. They are merely two recensions of the same; and there is reason for believing that there were other recensions. The Jerusalem Targum is but a fragmentary recension of the Pseudo-Jonathan.*

The object of these post-Talmudic versions was different from that of the earliest ones. They were designed to embody the current traditional expositions consisting in a large degree of legendary tales and absurd superstitions. Hence they furnish little if any assistance in the criticism of the text. They

* See Zunz, p. 66, et seq.

shew the mode of interpretation followed by the Jews, and many of their doctrines. The traditions they contain were drawn not only from the Talmud but from more ancient and freer Targums.

It was first published in Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible 1518 and following years; and afterwards in the 4th volume of the London Polyglott.

The Jerusalem Targum was not limited to the Pentateuch. Zunz has shewn that it comprehended Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Micah, Habakkuk, Zechariah; whence it is likely that it embraced all the books of the Old Testament.*

TARGUMS ON THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

There is a Chaldee version of the three books, Psalms, Job, and Proverbs. The Proverbs are best translated. The author was well acquainted with Hebrew and Chaldee, and commonly gives a literal and faithful version, without indulging in loose explanatory additions or inserting the fabulous legends belonging to later Jewish theology. The departures from the Hebrew text are few and unimportant, such as x. 20, xi. 4, 15. Still the language and style are inferior to Onkelos's and Jonathan's.

Its agreement with the old Syriac version has led many critics such as Dathe, Bauer, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, &c., to suppose that it was taken from *it* rather than the Hebrew. But the coincidence must be otherwise explained; chiefly by the kindred idioms of the two languages. While there are striking coincidences between them, as might be expected even from their literal character, they also differ in many important respects; so that the original must have been at the basis of both.

The version of the Psalms and Job is more paraphrastic,

* Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, p. 77, et seq.

resembling Jonathan's manner. All three have the same linguistic character, and originated about the same time and in the same country, probably Syria.* It is uncertain whether they proceeded from the same individual, as stated by Hävernick.† Their use in criticism is small.

This Targum was first published at Leiria in Portugal, 1492.

The Targum on the five Megilloth, viz. Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Ecclesiastes, can scarcely be called a *translation*. It is rather a *hagadical* commentary, containing numerous additions, allusions to Israelitish history, fables, and legends. Ruth and Lamentations are a little better than the rest; Ecclesiastes more paraphrastic; Esther the same in a greater degree than Ecclesiastes. But Solomon's Song is a proper *midrash*, presenting an allegorical and mystical interpretation designed to exalt the Jewish people. The anachronisms of the author betray his gross ignorance of history. The five were probably paraphrased by the same person, who lived long after the Talmudic period. The tradition which makes him Rabbi Joseph the one-eyed, is contradicted by writers of the thirteenth century.‡ The Targum on the Megilloth was published along with the Hebrew text and the commentary of Rashi at Venice 1524, 4to, and subsequently in the Rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg, Buxtorf, as well as in the Antwerp, Paris, and London Polyglotts.

There are besides two Targums on Esther, one printed in the third volume of the Antwerp Polyglott without many digressions and legends; and another in the London Polyglott, abounding in all manner of fables and stories. These two however are one and the same work. Another was published by Francis Tayler at London 1655, 4to, *along with the preceding*, of a still fuller character. He calls it Targum *posterius*,

* See Zunz, p. 64. † Einleitung, vol. i. Zweyte Abtheilung, p. 88.
‡ See Zunz, p. 65.

distinguishing it from the *Targum prius* of the Antwerp Polyglott.

A Targum on the books of Chronicles was first published by Beck from an Erfurt MS. 1680, 1683, 4to, at Augsburgh in two volumes. But the text has many gaps and imperfections. Another and more correct MS. was found at Cambridge by Wilkins, who published it with a Latin translation, Amsterdam 1715, 4to. Like the rest, it is very paraphrastical. Its late origin is evident from various circumstances, particularly the use of the Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch. Beck ascribes it to *Rabbi Joseph.*

As far as our knowledge extends, there is no Targum on Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The reason assigned in the Talmud for not translating Daniel is because the book reveals the exact time of Messiah's advent. Perhaps the true cause was a fear of joining the sacred text of the original to that of a paraphrase, since there are Chaldee sections in these books. The superstition of the Jews revolted from such profanity. It is true that there are no Chaldee pieces in Nehemiah; but it was taken with Ezra as *one book.*

With the exception of Onkelos and Jonathan, the Targums are of small use in criticism. They follow the Masoretic text. It is not denied that they contain some readings different from those now current; and that they appear to have been altered here and there. The MSS. of them also vary considerably. But though they might be more skilfully and correctly edited, it is not likely that the text would differ much from what has been already printed. They may be advantageously used in suggesting readings of some importance and value. Perhaps they are more useful in interpretation than the lower criticism.

CHAPTER XV.

SAMARITAN VERSION OF THE PENTATEUCH.

THERE is a version of the Pentateuch in the Samaritan dialect. It is made, as might have been expected, from that copy of the Pentateuch which the Samaritans have had for so many centuries. Hence it exhibits the interpolations and additions which characterise the recension it follows. But in some cases it departs from the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch as printed in the Polyglotts, and agrees with MSS. of it having other readings; as in Exod. viii. 29, xxii. 25; Levit. xvii. 13; Numb. xx. 10.* Sometimes it has a reading which is found in only one MS.;† and in two places (Gen. xiii. 8; Deut. xxxiii. 3) it leaves the Samaritan and agrees with the Jewish copy.‡

The character of it is literality and faithfulness to the original text. It follows the latter word for word. But there are exceptions to this its general character; for whenever it was thought that obscurity or offence might arise from close adherence to the letter, a degree of freedom was taken. Thus for the sake of avoiding obscurity and making the meaning more palpable, it has in Gen. vi. 4, *heroes of excellency* instead of *men of name.* In Gen. xv. 5, *thy successors*, for *thy seed.* In Levit. xvii. 10, we read, *I will excite mine anger*, for וְנָתַתִּי

* See Winer, de Versionis Pentateuchi Samaritanae indole, p. 18.

† Ibid, p. 21. ‡ Gesenius, de Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, &c. p. 19.

פָּנַי, *I will put my face.* For the same reason the old geographical names are changed into modern ones as in Gen. xiv. 14, *Paneas* for *Dan;* in xii. 8, *Ainah* for *Ai;* in xx. 1, *Ascalon* for *Gerar.* In order to remove things objectionable or calculated to offend, tropical expressions are resolved into others; anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions are softened or removed; and everything calculated to give sensuous ideas of the Supreme Being, to favour heathen or polytheistic notions of him, is altered. Like some other translations it changes the names *Jehovah* and *Elohim* into *the angel of God,* as in Gen. v. 24, xvii. 22, xviii. 33; Numb. xxiii. 4, 5.*

It has been observed by Winer, that the translator has failed to give the sense of many easy passages, because similar letters are interchanged, false etymologies followed, or a false punctuation adopted; while in intricate passages, where the construction is embarrassed or some expressions rare, the sense is rightly given.

Its agreement with the Targum of Onkelos deserves attention. To account for it, some have thought that the translator used the latter as a help in making his own. But this is hardly correct, for there are many difficult places in which he departs from Onkelos and agrees with versions which Onkelos could not have seen. His translation too is more literal than that of Onkelos. The harmony may be explained by the kindred nature of the Samaritan and Chaldee dialects, and the poverty of each not permitting a wide choice of expressions. They are also translations of the same text made apparently on the same principle. Probably also, the Samaritan has been interpolated from Onkelos, especially in the MSS. still unprinted. The text indeed seems to have passed through several hands whence it received additions. Hence we find two different readings of one passage, glosses originally belonging to the

* See Winer, § 11.

margin now in the text, and differences between MSS. and the printed text in cases where interpolations are evident.

As the version is very literal, it is in general easy to see the reading which the translator had before him. Its use however cannot be great apart from the Samaritan text. It has but one voice in connexion with its parent. Hence the authority belonging to it resolves itself into that of the recension it follows.

The author and date of it are alike unknown. The Samaritan account is that it was made by Nathanael,* a Samaritan priest who must have lived twenty years before Christ, according to the Samaritan chronicle. This is more than doubtful. The fathers of the third and fourth centuries speak of a text they call Σαμαρειτικὸν, which shews the prior existence of our Samaritan version. Hence it was made either in the third century or more probably in the second, when the zeal for versions was so great.†

This version was first printed in the Paris Polyglott, whence it was transferred to the London with Morin's Latin translation amended. The first eighteen chapters of Genesis were separately printed at Halle 1750, 4to.

* See De Sacy's Memoire sur l'état actuel des Samaritains. Paris 1812.

† See Herbst, Einleit. vol. i. pp. 190, 191.

CHAPTER XVI.

PESHITO OR OLD SYRIAC VERSION.

BEFORE proceeding to describe the Syriac versions it may be useful to observe, that the modes of writing in Syrian books are somewhat different. The most ancient character is the *Estrangelo* (ܐܣܛܪܢܓܝܠܐ), so called according to J. D. Michaelis and Adler from the Arabic سطر *scriptura* and انجيل *evangelium*, *i. e.* the large character used in writing out copies of *the Gospel.* Asseman was probably right in deriving the name from the Greek στρογγύλος, *round;* though the conjecture has not met with much favour. Although this character is found in the most ancient MSS. till the year 800 A.D. it was not then discontinued; and it is still used, in the titles of books particularly; for which purpose its large and heavy forms are very suitable.

The *double* character which the Syrians also used in the titles of books and elsewhere is substantially the same as the Estrangelo.

After the eighth century the character called *Nestorian*, or more properly *Chaldean*, as Asseman and Wiseman term it, was introduced. It is like the Estrangelo but *smaller.* The most usual character, and that employed in our printed books is called ܣܝܡܬܐ *simple.* This is the smallest. It was most used by the Maronites and Jacobites, though they also fre-

quently employed the Estrangelo and Nestorian characters. There is a good table representing the different forms of the Syrian letters in Hoffmann's *Grammatica Syriaca*, table ii. p. 68.

There is a version of the Old and New Testaments commonly called the *old Syriac* or Peshito. The name Peshito (ܦܫܝܛܐ) is simply the Chaldee פְּשִׁיטָא *simple, single, i. e.* expressing the sense of the words, in opposition to *midrashim* or allegorical interpretations. We should therefore judge from the title that it is a *faithful* version.

The particular age of this translation is uncertain, though all admit that it is very ancient. Its antiquity is involved in obscurity. The first writer who refers to it is Ephraem the Syrian, who died in 376 A.D. At the time he wrote, it was current in the Syrian churches. He had it before him as the basis of his commentaries or scholia on the Bible. He refers to it by the title of *our version*, shewing that it was the authorised church version of the Syrian Christians. And then the mode in which this father made use of it evinces its antiquity. Many expressions and phrases in it were obscure. They required explanation. Accordingly he has given interpretations of various words in it, which are not always correct. The cause of this obscurity in the days of Ephraem may not however lie in the antiquity of the version, but in the circumstance of its being written in a dialect different from that which prevailed about Edessa where Ephraem resided. The dialect in which it is composed is mixed with words of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin origin—the dialect probably of western Syria; whereas that of eastern Syria was purer. We think that *both* circumstances contributed to the fact of many terms being unintelligible at the time Ephraem wrote. The version was made when the Aramaean language was mixed with many Greek words *and* in western Syria, where the dialect was always more corrupt than about Edessa.

The Syriac of the Peshito had begun to grow old in the days of this father. Hence the version must have existed a considerable period before. A century will hardly suffice for that period. The version must have belonged to the middle of the third century according to Ephraem's mode of speaking about it and dealing with it.*

The traditional records of the Syrians themselves attribute a very high antiquity to the Peshito. Gregory Bar Hebraeus says that there were three opinions. One that the version was made in the time of Solomon and Hiram; the second that it owed its origin to Asa the priest sent from Assyria to Samaria; the third, that it was made in the days of Thaddeus the apostle and Abgarus king of Osrhoene, at which time the New Testament also was translated.†

It is obvious that the first two assumptions cannot be entertained for a moment. They savour strongly of national pride and self-complacency.

The third opinion seems to have been that held by Bar Hebraeus and Jacob of Edessa. It contains nothing very improbable, though we should hesitate to adopt it.

Jesudad B. von Hadath (in the ninth century) places a part of the version in the times of Solomon; the remainder of the Old Testament together with the New is ascribed to the apostle Thaddeus.

But though most of these traditions partake largely of the fabulous, Hävernick finds some truth at the basis of them, and concludes that the account given by Jacob of Edessa is substantially entitled to reception. We fear that it cannot be relied on in any degree. It is too suspicious.

It is of more consequence in proving the early origin of the version before us to refer to the Syriac literature current in the second century. Bardesanes, in the second century of

* Wiseman, Horae Syriacae, vol. i. p. 121, et seq. † Ibid, p. 90.

the Christian era, wrote several works in his native tongue which excited the admiration of Jerome.* Harmonius, his son, was the favourite poet of the Syrians. If therefore Syriac literature had advanced so far in the second half of the second century; if several treatises of Bardesanes had been translated into Greek by his friends; if controversial works such as those of Bardesanes against Marcion were received with applause, it is likely that a translation of the Bible existed in the national language. Thus the version belongs not improbably to the second century. The necessity of having it would be felt as early as that time.† This is corroborated by a circumstance which Moses of Chorene relates in his history of Armenia, viz. that Bardesanes came into Armenia to convert the heathen there, but failing in his attempt he went into a temple on a certain festival, read there the temple histories, and translated them into Syriac. Now if profane literature were translated from Armenian into Syriac, it is probable that the Bible had been rendered into the national language; especially as the task of translating Hebrew was easy because of the similarity of the two dialects. Thus we are brought again to the middle of the second century at least, for the first appearance of the Syriac translation.‡ Origen according to Eusebius found a copy of it with a widow, as Bar Hebraeus relates.

Michaelis, in assigning it to the first century, appeals to Melito who lived about the year 170. It appears that a scholion attributed to him has been found in his commentary on the Septuagint, Genesis xxii. 13, stating that "the Syriac and the Hebrew, Ὁ Σύρος καὶ ὁ Ἑβραῖος have in this passage the word 'hanging,' in order to render it a more conspicuous type

* De Script. eccles.

† Hug, Einleit. in die Schriften des neuen Testaments, vol. i. pp. 315, 316, fourth edition.

‡ Herbst, Einleit. vol. i. p. 195. § Wiseman, Horae Hebraicae, p. 90.

of the cross."* But there is much reason for questioning the authenticity of this marginal note. Writers of the fourth and fifth centuries refer to Ὁ Σύρος, viz. Diodorus of Tarsus, Eusebius of Emesa, and Theodoret of Cyrus, meaning, as is most likely, the Syriac version; but this scholion of Melito appears to be apocryphal. No reliance can be placed on it.

It has been debated whether the author of the Peshito in the Old Testament part was a Jew or a Christian; Simon † believed that he was a Jew; Dathe,‡ that he was a Jewish-Christian. But later writers generally have maintained that he was a Christian, relying on such arguments as the universal reception of the version among all sects and parties of Syrian Christians; the negligence observable in the enumeration of unclean animals (Levit. xi. and Deut. xiv.) where some names are omitted; § the translation of the Hebrew word עַלְמָה in Isaiah vii. 14, by ܒܬܘܠܬܐ, while the same word in all other places is rendered ܥܠܡܬܐ; the rendering of אֵל in Isaiah ix. 6 by ܐܠܗܐ, of יְהוָה in Isaiah lii. 15, by ܡܪܝܐ, and of למו by ܠܗ. ‖ But these considerations are scarcely *valid proofs* of the position. Objections might be made to them. Still when taken together they are of some weight. The titles of the Psalms manifestly betray a Christian origin. The Syriac language appears also to have been confined to Christian writers. At least there is not the smallest trace of its use by a Jew. Besides, the simple literality of the version, unlike the manner of Aquila, speaks in favour of a Christian origin. We doubt not therefore, that the translation was made by a Christian rather than a Jew.

* Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament by Marsh, vol. ii. pp. 29, 30. † Histoire Critique, p. 305, ed. 1680.

‡ Praefat. ad Psalterium Syriacum, p. 23, et seq.

§ Hirzel, de Pentateuchi versionis Syriacae quam Peschito vocant indole, § 27.

‖ Gesenius, Commentar ueber den Jesaia, vol. i. pp. 85, 86.

Eichhorn endeavoured to shew from internal evidence, that there were several persons engaged in the translation,* or rather that it was put together out of the works of several Syrian translators. But his arguments are scarcely satisfactory. Yet Scholz † confidently repeats that its character impartially considered shews a plurality of persons, as if it were an ascertained thing about which there can be little or no doubt. The traditional accounts of the Syrians are favourable to a plurality of translators; but little weight can be attached to them. A remark of Ephraem has also been quoted by Hävernick, in which the Syrian father speaks of *the persons* who translated the passage into Syriac. We must confess however that this observation is weak evidence in favour of several translators. It is still probable that the Old Testament at least was translated by one person.

According to the statements of Ephraem and Bar Hebraeus it was made from the original Hebrew. This indeed is obvious to any one who reads it. It adheres closely to the original, reproducing it both faithfully and literally. In point of fidelity it is the best of all the ancient versions. Its renderings are generally happy, free from paraphrastic circumlocutions on the one hand and bald literality on the other. Occasionally the translator has given freer and arbitrary interpretations; but without introducing anything like Jonathan's or the Jerusalem Targum's insertions. Very seldom does he bring extraneous ideas into the text, seldomer perhaps than any other ancient translator.

A strong leaning to the Greek version of the Seventy has often attracted observation; and the question has been asked, whether the translator made use of the Greek version. But it is impossible to give a satisfactory answer. The circumstances of the case hardly admit of it. Gesenius has produced a number of examples from the book of Isaiah, to show that

* Einleit. vol. ii. p. 133, et seq. † Einleitung, vol. i. p. 518.

the Septuagint was followed even in free and arbitrary interpretations;* though he admits that the Syriac much more frequently departs from the Alexandrine in these cases. In like manner, Credner who has minutely examined the minor prophets, thinks that the Septuagint was employed there.† On the other hand, Hirzel who investigated the Pentateuch remarks, that the most important evidence of the translator's availing himself of the Seventy, viz. agreement in difficult passages, is wanting in the five books of Moses.‡ This remark is extended by Herbst to the other books of the Old Testament, and the position assumed that other proofs of the alleged fact are also absent. The learned professor endeavours to shew, that whereas in the historical books the Greek version has additions to the Hebrew text of greater or less extent, the Syriac wants them. On the contrary, the latter has additions and omissions which one seeks for in vain in the Seventy. In like manner he has remarked, that in the case of proper names, which presented much difficulty to the ancient translators, the Syriac departs often enough from the Alexandrine, though in the second century it was the current belief that the Greek was made by Palestinians well acquainted with places and objects mentioned in the Bible. As to the poetical books Herbst believes that the Song of Solomon is quite free from the influence of the Greek.§

But notwithstanding this line of argument, which in itself is by no means convincing, the influence of the Septuagint on the version as we now have it, is tolerably clear. It cannot well be denied. Even Herbst admits it in the case of the poetical books especially the Psalms, and in the prophetic books. But he accounts for the coincidence by *subsequent*

* Commentar ueber den Jesaia, vol. i. p. 82, et seq.

† De prophetarum minorum versionis Syriacae, quam Peschito vocant indole, p. 107, et seq. ‡ De Pentateuchi versionis, &c. § 24.

§ Herbst, Einleit. vol. i. pp. 196, 197.

interpolation. The Greek was consulted *afterwards* for the purpose of revising the Peshito. Such too is the opinion of Hävernick.* It is a bold thing to deny that the Septuagint was not consulted by the translator himself, because he frequently departs from it even in difficult cases. Surely he was capable of making a discriminating use of it, having sufficient knowledge of the Hebrew, and judgment to think for himself. It is also a bold thing to deny that interpolations out of the Greek were not afterwards taken into the text. Both may have happened; and it is likely that both did happen. But who shall now separate the passages, which, in their original form were moulded after the Alexandrine, and the passages which have been interpolated in succeeding centuries? The thing is impossible. It is probable, that in some instances in which this version agrees with the Seventy it has lost its original form. In others it has retained it, shewing that the translator did not neglect that version which was so commonly received among the early Christians. Perhaps Hävernick is correct in inferring from the example of Jacob of Edessa, that the Peshito was revised after the Syro-Hexaplar text; or that attempts were made to bring both into harmony with one another.

A similar inquiry has been instituted in relation to the Chaldee paraphrases as to the Septuagint. There is a tolerable likeness between the Syriac and Chaldee in many places. Gesenius has produced a number of examples from Isaiah to shew that the Targum was used there. Credner is of the same opinion in regard to the minor prophets.‡ But Hävernick and Herbst doubt the fact, the latter denying that the instances produced by Gesenius shew the dependence of the one document on the other.§ Hävernick thinks that the Jewish colouring is sufficiently explained by the fact that

* Einleit. vol. i. part ii. p. 93. † Commentar, vol. i. pp. 83, 84.
‡ De Prophetarum min. vers. Syr. &c. p. 107. § Einleit. vol. i. p. 197.

the current exegetical tradition lying at the basis of the Seventy and of the Targums, was Jewish.* It seems to us that original traces of the use of a Targum are too distinct to be denied, especially in the case of the prophetic books.

The text lying at the basis of the version is substantially the Masoretic one. But it departs from it in many cases and exhibits better readings. Not that these deviations should be always adopted; for they are often inferior to the Masoretic readings. Care should be taken not to convert the mistakes of the translator into various readings, or to suppose the existence of variations where there are none. A cautious and diligent examination of the version will supply some readings superior to the Masoretic; but not so many as the extent and antiquity of the version might lead one to suppose.

The Peshito contains all the canonical books of the Old Testament. It did not originally comprehend the apocryphal books; for we learn that the apocryphal additions to Daniel were wanting in the time of Ephraem, as also the books of Maccabees. In like manner Pococke, who examined MSS. of the version, formed the same conclusion from the subscriptions belonging to them. Yet most of the apocryphal books were translated into Syriac out of the Greek *very early;* for Ephraem cites them, but without reckoning them canonical.†

Gregory Bar Hebraeus says that the version before us has an impure, rude, and inelegant diction. Asseman gave passages to this effect from Bar Hebraeus's grammar,‡ to which Wiseman§ added another. In consequence of this opinion, it has been conjectured by the latter that the Peshito exhibits the impure dialect used by the inhabitants of Palestine and Libanus in contradistinction to the pure and elegant dialect which prevailed at Edessa and in all ulterior Syria.‖

* Einleit. vol. i. part ii. p. 93. † Hävernick, Einleit. vol. i. part ii. p. 96.
‡ Bibliotheca Orient. vol. ii. p. 279, et seq. § Horae Syriacae, p. 106.
‖ Ibid, pp. 106, 107.

In progress of time, when the Syrian church was divided into different sections, the version underwent various recensions. It is well known that it was highly valued by all the Syrian communities eastern and western, by Nestorians and Monophysites; and that it was adopted as their authorised translation. But though it was received by all the churches, it was not perhaps highly esteemed by all their members. Gregory Bar Hebraeus, for example, speaks of it unfavourably;* but this was probably owing to his excessive partiality for the Seventy. Historical criticism, says Eichhorn, had not then cleansed the origin of the Alexandrine from the common fables so long current; and the superstitious belief in its inspiration was fostered by the fact that the New Testament often quotes it.

The recension of the Nestorians is well known from the scholia of Bar Hebraeus. The same writer speaks of the *Karkaphensian* recension, which belonged to the Monophysites. The name which means *mountainous*, points to the place of its origin, mount *Sigara*, where there was a monastery of Jacobite Christians. Wiseman, who examined two MSS. at Rome, one in the Vatican (153), and the other in the Barberinian library (101), has shewn that this recension leans towards the Greek text, and is distinguished by a peculiar pointing, but that it does not differ essentially from the common text of the Peshito. Bar Hebraeus also mentions *oriental* and *occidental* MSS. relating perhaps to the respective recensions of the two ecclesiastical parties.†

The Old Testament part was first printed in the Paris Polyglott, under the superintendence of Gabriel Sionita a Maronite Christian. But the MS. he had was very imperfect. It was deficient not only in many passages but in whole books. These deficiencies were supplied from the Vulgate. The

* "Quassatum fundamentum."—See Wiseman, p. 90.

† Wiseman, Horae Syriacae, pp. 149-257.

learned editor furnished the text with vowel points, and gave a Latin translation, in which he adhered to the words of the Vulgate where he thought they suited the Syrian text. From the Paris Polyglott, Walton transferred it to the London, supplying the deutero-canonical books, and additions to them. Though the learned editor severely blames Gabriel Sionita in relation to the text as well as the Latin version given by the Maronite critic, and boasts of the improved condition it presents in his edition, it has been found, that he reprinted the same text and did not improve the Latin translation, but contented himself with supplying the wanting books, and placing the results of a collation of three MSS. in the sixth volume of the Polyglott made by Herbert Thornedyke. "It is usually thought that the text of Walton received some improvements from the manuscripts of Ussher and Pococke, but from an actual collation of a great part of the London Polyglott, I may venture to say this is not the case. Nor have I yet found any instance in which the Latin translation has been corrected by Walton, although he loudly complains of its inaccuracy. As regards the typography, the Paris is certainly the most correct; the only addition made by Walton was some apocryphal books."*

In modern times the British and Foreign Bible Society bore the expense of an edition of the Syrian Bible, prepared for the use of the Syrian Christians in Malabar, under the editorship of Dr. S. Lee. In this edition the first attempt was made to revise the text on MS. authority. The editor not only collated the three MSS. from which the readings are given in the 6th volume of the London Polyglott, viz. two of Ussher and one of Pococke, in the Bodleian library, but three others, viz. a Travancore one brought from India by Buchanan, containing all the Old and New Testament books except the Apocalypse; another belonging to Dr. A. Clarke, containing all the Old Testament books except the Psalms;

* Lee in the Classical Journal for March and June 1821, vol. xxiii. p. 247, note.

and a very ancient one in the library of New College, Oxford, containing the Pentateuch. In addition to these, he examined in part the commentaries of Ephraem and those of Bar Hebraeus. What influence the editor allowed these MSS. to exercise upon the text he has not said. "In my choice," says he, "of readings the greatest care was taken. To the canons of the best critics my best attention was given, and my alterations were made accordingly."*

It is pretty clear however, that though the collations in question have contributed to the production of a more correct text than that of Walton, the editor has made fewer changes than might have been expected. He has given a revised text; but it is only a small help to a better and more correct one. And it is matter of regret that he has never published his collations of Syriac MSS. A good critical edition is still a desideratum; and we understand that it is likely to be supplied by Cureton, from the very valuable Nitrian MSS. belonging to the British Museum. But Dr. Lee says, "I have seen the MSS. brought by Archdeacon Tattam from the monastery in the desert of Nitria, and although some of these are much older than those to which I had access, yet I feel strong in the opinion that nothing can be had from any of these, or from any other documents accessible to us, likely at all to restore the Syriac Peshito text of the Old Testament to what it once was."†

His edition appeared, without vowels, but with the diacritic points, in 1823, 4to, London, with the title—*Vetus Testamentum Syriace, eos tantum libros sistens, qui in canone Hebraeo habentur, ordine vero quoad fieri potuit, apud Syros usitato dispositos. In usum ecclesiae Syrorum Malabar. jussu Societat. Biblic. recognovit et ad fidem codd. MSS. emendavit, S. Lee.*

Kirsch reprinted the Pentateuch from the London Polyglott, 1787, Leipzig, 4to; while the Psalter was often printed, on Mount Lebanon, 1585, fol. and 1610; at Leyden by Erpenius, 1625, 4to; at Halle by Dathe, 1768, 8vo.

* Letter addressed to the author. † Ibid.

CHAPTER XVII.

ARABIC VERSIONS.

It is generally supposed that all versions of the Scriptures in the Arabic language are later than the Mohammedan era, when, after the conquests of the Saracens, Arabic became the vernacular language of Christian countries, and translations were consequently required. There is little historical proof of the existence of such versions before the time of Mohammed; though the Christian religion was early preached in Arabia, and worshipping societies formed who professed to believe its divine authority. The first translation of any part of the Bible was made by Warka the son of Naufel, who died three years after Mohammed set forth his claim to prophecy. He translated the gospels (the Bible) into Arabic, which accounts for Mohammed's acquaintance with it, as proved by the Koran. The passage which records that he translated the gospels into Arabic, is found in a commentary on the life of the prophet by Ibrahim of Haleb, published at Cairo in 1833.* But some doubt the truth of its statement.

The following Arabic versions have been made from the Hebrew text.

1. A translation made by Saadias surnamed *Gaon* or *Haggaon*, *the excellent* or *illustrious*, a learned Jew. According to the Jewish notices of him, the author belonged to Phithom or Faiyum in Egypt. From 927 till 934 A.D. he was presi-

* See Oriental Christian Spectator for March 1838, p. 88, where the Arabic is very incorrectly printed.

dent of the Jewish Academy at Sora or Sura in Babylonia and died in 942.* From Saadias we have a version of the Pentateuch and Isaiah. Its character is free and paraphrastical. It is evident that the author was more intent on *the sense* than *the letter;* and therefore he has often departed from the original words, choosing more suitable ones, resolving tropes, inserting the particle of similitude. With the names of places he has taken most freedom, putting the later for the earlier, such as Paneas for Dan, Batanea for Bashan, Nablus for Sichem, &c. &c. He has done the same thing in the case of countries and nations. The present Masoretic text lies at the basis of it.†

But though it must have proceeded from Saadias in a free paraphrastic form, it is hardly allowable to infer from the present printed text that its original condition was the same. Transcribers appear to have taken liberties with it; so that if several MSS. were found, some of them would correspond more nearly with the Hebrew text. It has also been interpolated; for systematic alterations may be distinctly traced. Of these insertions, the basis is a Samaritan-Arabic version. It is scarcely possible to support by example the suspicions of some, that the Septuagint furnished contributions to its text. In consequence of its adherence to the Masoretic text and its subsequent interpolation, it is of little or no use in criticism.

The Pentateuch was first printed, with Hebrew letters, at Constantinople, 1546, folio. It was afterwards printed in the Paris and London Polyglotts. Isaiah was edited by Paulus, from a MS. in the Bodleian library, written in the year 1244 with Hebrew letters, at Jena 1790, 1791. The editor transcribed it into the Arabic character, and appended vowel points. Erpenius and Pococke conjectured that Saadias translated all the books of the Old Testament. This is very probable, because there is a translation of the Psalms and Job by him

* See Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten, vol. vi. p. 86, et seq.

† Gesenius, Commentar ueber den Jesaia, vol. i. p. 90, et seq.

among the Arabic MSS. of the Bodleian; because David Kimchi quotes his translation of Hosea; and because Haneberg has described a Munich MS. containing Saadias's version of the Psalms.

2. The Arabic translation of Joshua in the Paris and London Polyglotts has been made from the Hebrew, and is entitled to the praise of excellence. The individual who executed it had a good knowledge of Hebrew; and expresses the sense well, even in cases where others have not done so. The version is faithful and generally literal. Occasionally, it deviates from the original, as in i. 2; iii. 16; iv. 7, 8; ix. 7-15; x. 10. Additions are also found in iii. 17; iv. 6, 22, 23; viii. 19; xi. 1. Here we find the addition of the Septuagint in ix. 3. Instead of *Joshua*, *God* occurs, as in the Vatican MS. The author and age of the version are unknown.*

3. The Arabic version in the Polyglotts of Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, and Nehemiah, has been taken from the Peshito, with the exception of 1 Kings xii.—2 Kings xii. 16; and Nehem. i.-ix. 27, which are taken from the Hebrew. According to Roediger, who was the first to point out the true sources of these books, the fragment of the books of Kings proceeded from a Jew in the eleventh century. He also attributes the version of Nehemiah to a Jew; but thinks that it was subsequently altered by Christian hands after the Peshito.†

4. The Arabic version of the Pentateuch edited by Erpenius at Leyden in 1622, was made from the original by an African Jew in the thirteenth century. It follows the Masoretic text word for word; so that the editor deemed it unnecessary to give a Latin translation. It is of little critical value.

5. An Arabic translation of Genesis, Psalms, and Daniel, exists in MS. in the British Museum (No. 5503) by Rabbi

* Herbst, Einleit. vol. i. pp. 213, 214.

† De origine et indole Arabicae librorum V. T. Historicorum interpret. Halis, 1829, 4to.

Saadias Ben Levi Asnekoth, a learned Jew of Morocco belonging to the first half of the seventeenth century. As might be expected, it seldom departs from the Masoretic text, and gives the Rabbinical significations of words. Criticism can derive no assistance from it. It was described by Doederlein.*

6. Among Pococke's MSS. preserved in the Bodleian is one containing an Arabic Psalter, of which Schnurrer published xvi. xl. cx. in Hebrew characters. Criticism need not expect much from it.

7. In the library at Mannheim there is also an Arabic version of Genesis with an interlinear version in the Malay language. Judging from the specimen of it given by Rinck, it is of no importance to criticism.†

8. After the Samaritans had lost their ancient tongue, and adopted in common life that of their Arabian conquerors, they must have felt the want of an Arabic version of their sacred writings. For a time they used the translation of Saadias Gaon; but it fell into disfavour very soon. Saadias had been a Jew; and besides, he translated from the copy of the Jews, not from the Samaritan Pentateuch. The manner too in which he translated must have appeared awkward to them. Hence *Abu Said*, one of themselves, undertook a new version for the benefit of his brethren. Six MSS. of it are known to be now in Europe; but only portions have been printed from them. Genesis has been recently printed entire for the first time, from three MSS. by Kuenen, at Leyden. One of the six MSS. is at Rome accompanied by the Samaritan original and the Samaritan version, written in Samaritan letters, commonly called the Barberinian Triglott.‡ Blanchini§ and

* Repertorium, Theil ii. p. 153, et seq.

† See Eichhorn's Bibliothek, vol. x.

‡ See Adler's Biblisch-Kritische Reise, p. 137, et seq.

§ Evangeliarium quadruplex, part ii. p. 614.

Hwid* gave specimens of it. Two are in the royal library at Paris, written in Arabic letters. These were described, and specimens given by De Sacy.† Two others are in the Bodleian at Oxford, the one written in Samaritan, the other in the Arabic character, from which Castell gave some passages in the sixth volume of the London Polyglott. The sixth MS. in Arabic letters is at Leyden, and has been accurately described by Van Vloten,‡ who has also given copious extracts from it.

It is evident that this version follows the Samaritan Pentateuch because it agrees with it where the Hebrew copy differs. It is plain also that the translator had the version of Saadias before him, and made considerable use of it, as well as of the Samaritan version. Aided by these works, and possessing a good knowledge of Samaritan-Hebrew, Abu Said produced a faithful and very literal version; the language being good, intelligible, and even ornate. In preparing a critical edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch it may be of use; but in other respects, the critic can derive no assistance from it. It is considered of great value in the history of the Samaritan Pentateuch, because comparatively few sources exist for the emendation of that ancient copy. The author, like a true Samaritan, has carefully sought to remove from his book everything which appeared to him derogatory or unsuitable to the divine Majesty. Hence *angels* or *an angel* are often introduced instead of *Jehovah*. The version is accompanied with scholia or notes paraphrasing or justifying its renderings, explaining obscure passages, combating the Jews, &c. The author must have lived between the middle of the tenth and the commencement of the thirteenth centuries. This follows from his having used the work of

* Specimen ineditae versionis Arabico-Samaritanae Pentateuchi, &c. 1780, Romae, 8vo.

† In Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek, vol. x. p. 1, et seq.

‡ Specimen Philologicum continens descriptionem codicis MS. bibliothecae Lugduno-Batavae, &c. Lugduni, 1803, 4to.

Saadias, who died in 942; and from the fact that the greatest part of the Barberinian Triglott was written in 1226. Bauer* places it in the year 1070; on what authority it is impossible to discover, for the author may have belonged to the twelfth as well as to the eleventh century.

PERSIAN VERSIONS.

It is probable that the Scriptures were early translated into the Persian language. Chrysostom† and Theodoret‡ speak of a Persian version; and the Pentateuch existed in Persia long before Mohammed, according to Maimonides.§ The translation of the Pentateuch printed in the London Polyglott is of later origin than the false prophet. This is clear from Babel (Gen. x. 2) being rendered Bagdad, and from the internal character of the version itself. It was made by a Jew, Rabbi Jacob the son of Joseph Tawus. The sense of *Tawus* is obscure; some, as Lorsbach,‖ taking it to be a proper name signifying in the Persian tongue *peacock;* while others, as Rosenmüller,¶ refer it to his birthplace *Tus*, a city of Persia. Its age is uncertain. Rosenmüller places it in the ninth century; Lorsbach in the sixteenth. As to the character of the version it is very literal, so much so as to violate the Persian idiom by retaining Hebrew words and even entire sentences. It cannot be of any use in criticism. It was first published in the Polyglott Pentateuch of Constantinople in Hebrew characters; whence it was transcribed, chiefly by Hyde, into the Arabico-Persian character, and the deficiencies supplied by a translation of Hyde's own, for the purpose of being printed in the London Polyglott.

* Critica Sacra, p. 334. † Homil. ii. in Joannem.

‡ De curando Graecarum affectionum.

§ See Zunz's Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, p. 9, note *a*.

‖ In the Jena Allgem. Literatur Zeitung for 1816, p. 459.

¶ De versione Pentateuchi Persica Commentatio, Lipsiae, 1814, 4to.

CHAPTER XVIII.

LATIN VERSIONS.

It is now impossible to discover when and by whom the Old Testament was first translated into Latin. It has often been inferred, chiefly from the words of Augustine, that many* Latin versions existed in his time, and that one among them held a principal place called by that father *versio Itala, the Italic version.*† But on this point much misapprehension has prevailed. In the first place Augustine is speaking of the New Testament alone, and therefore nothing can be deduced from his language in regard to the Old. There is also good ground for believing that his expressions are hyperbolical and inexact. And in the third place, all the remains of the Latin Old Testament which can be collected from every quarter shew a substantial identity of version. The traces of the Latin which exist in the writings of the most ancient fathers who used it and in ancient MSS. evince one translation with a varying text. Conjectures have been made for the purpose of altering *Itala* in Augustine, as

* "Qui enim Scripturas ex hebraea lingua in graecam verterunt linguam, numerari possunt: latini autem interpretes nullo modo; ut enim cuivis primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex graecus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretare." De doctr. Christiana, Lib. ii. c. 11.

† "In ipsis autem interpretationibus *Itala* caeteris praeferatur: nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae." Ibid, c. 15.

though the word were a mistake; but none of them has found much favour. Thus Bentley thought it should be *illa;* Potter *usitata.* Both must be rejected; especially as another passage in Augustine favours the usual reading.* When Jerome speaks of the *vulgata editio, communis editio, vetus editio,* he means the Septuagint, as has been shewn by Leander Van Ess,† not the old Latin version of which Augustine called some copies *Itala.* In like manner, Augustine uses the phrase *interpretatio usitato,* but what it means is difficult to ascertain.‡ It is useless at the present day to controvert the opinion that only one Latin version existed in early times. Eichhorn§ was right in trying to shew that there was only one definite, distinct translation; and Jahn,|| Hug,¶ Van Ess,** are wrong in maintaining the opposite view. It is likely however that different parts of the Old Testament were translated by different persons and at different times, and that there were a great many varieties of reading in them, because each reader freely corrected the Latin interpretation or corrupted it in his own way. We must not conclude from the different expressions used in citing the same passage by the Latin fathers, that there were *so many different versions,* an error into which Herbst†† among others falls. All such differences resolve themselves very much into various readings of the text *in one and the same version.* It is probable

* "Ita si de fide exemplarium quaestio verteretur, sicut in nonnullis, quae paucae sunt et sacrarum litterarum notissimae sententiarum varietates vel ex *aliarum regionum codicibus unde ipsa doctrina commeavit,* nostra dubitatio dijudicaretur: vel si ibi quoque codices variarent, plures paucioribus, vetustiores recentioribus praeferrentur; et si adhuc esset incerta varietas, praecedens lingua, unde illud interpretatum est, consuleretur." Contr. Faust. xi. 2.

† See Pragmatisch-kritische Geschichte der Vulgata, § 2, p. 24, et seq.

‡ De consensu Evangell. Lib. ii. 66. § Einleit. vol. ii. p. 401, et seq.

|| Einleit. vol. i. p. 216, et seq. ¶ Einleit. vol. i. p. 403, et seq.

** Pragmatisch-kritische Geschichte der Vulg. p. 19, et seq.

†† Einleitung, vol. i. pp. 237, 238.

that only one, in different pieces and from more sources than one, had come into public use, which individuals meddled with very arbitrarily.

The first certain traces of the vetus or old Latin are found at the close of the second century. Tertullian quotes or refers to it. Some time therefore must have elapsed from its origin till it came into general circulation. Hence it may be dated in the last half of the second century.

As to its birth-place history is silent. It is probable that it was made in Africa, as Eichhorn rightly conjectured. There the Latin language was current in the earliest times of Christianity. In Italy Greek had taken the precedence of Latin in many quarters. Beyond a doubt this version had been altered and corrupted in many ways, so that Jerome affirms, "every one has at pleasure added or omitted according to his own judgment."* In this respect he refers especially to the copies which were circulated at Rome. It appears to have adhered literally to the Greek, from which it was made.† We find in it all the mistakes that disfigured the Septuagint before Origen's recension; for it followed the κοινή or *ante-hexaplaric* text. Hence it may be usefully applied to the emendation of the Seventy.

All the fragments of the old Latin version that could be discovered were published at Rome by Flaminius Nobilius under the sanction of Sixtus in 1588 folio. Afterwards, Sabatier collected and published a more copious work of the same kind, at Rheims, 1743, in three folio volumes, copies of which with a new title page were also issued at Paris, 1749-1751. The title will shew the extent and nature of the work:—*Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae; seu vetus Italica*

* "Maxime cum apud Latinos tot sint exemplaria quot codices, et unusquisque pro arbitrio suo vel addiderit vel subtraxerit quod ei visum est." Praefat. in Josua.

† Eichhorn, Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 407, et seq.

et ceterae quaecunque in codd. MSS. et antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: quae cum vulgata Latina et cum textu Graeco comparantur, &c. The first two volumes contain the Old Testament; the third the New, with an appendix from the Roman edition, containing the third and fourth books of Esdras, and Manasseh's prayer. An important supplement to this edition was furnished by Münter in *Fragmenta versionis antiquae latinae antehieronym. Prophetarum Jerem. Ezech. Dan. et Hoseae*, Hafniae 1819, in the Miscellanea Hafniens, vol. i. fascic. 1. This was taken from a rescript MS. at Wirceburg.

In order to remedy the confusion introduced into the text of this version by a variety of causes, Jerome undertook to revise and amend it about A.D. 382, at the request of Pope Damasus. He began with the New Testament. After this he procceded to revise the Psalter while he was at Rome. This revision, like that of the New Testament, was a hasty one,* in which the grossest mistakes alone were rectified. Subsequently he again revised the Psalter, after it had become as corrupt as it was before, more accurately and critically than formerly, conformably to the Hexaplar text of Origen with the obeli and asterisks. The former revision was called the *Roman Psalter*, because it was used in the Romish Church; the second, the *Gallican Psalter*, because it was afterwards adopted in the churches of Gaul. The latter was made by him at Bethlehem between 384 and 390 or 391 A.D.

In the same manner did he proceed gradually with all the books of the Old Testament, with Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Chronicles, correcting their text by the Hexapla. In his Apology against Rufinus he speaks merely of these six books. Hence it has been conjectured by some, that he revised no more.† In confirmation of this it has been stated that

* "Psalterium Romae dudum positus, emendaram, et juxta lxx interpretes, licet *cursim*, magna tamen ex parte correxeram." Praefat. ad Edit. poster. Psalmorum.

† De Wette, Einleit. p. 82.

double prefaces exist only to these.* But that is an error, for there are not double prefaces to Proverbs and Canticles. Judging from Jerome's own language we should infer that he revised *all* the canonical books of the Old Testament.† Most of them however were lost by the treachery of some person to whom he had committed the MS.‡ Only two books, Psalms and Job have descended to us. The translation of the Psalms as hastily revised by Jerome is embodied in the Romish missal, or rather in that copy of it which is used at St. Peter's at Rome only; for the *Gallican* Psalter is contained in the ordinary Romish Psalter.

While Jerome was engaged in correcting the old Latin translation, he began to make a new version from the Hebrew. To this undertaking he had been prompted by the request of various friends. He had also in view an important object, viz. to assist Christians in their controversies with the Jews. The treachery of a friend had not extinguished his literary ardour. It merely served to stimulate him to higher exertions in the cause of sacred criticism. He resolved no longer to remain contented with revising the translation of a translation, for such in reality was the old Latin version of the Bible, but to undertake the more difficult task of rendering the Old Testament at once from the Hebrew into Latin. About the year 385 he began the work with the books of Samuel and Kings, which were followed by the greater and lesser prophets, the writings attributed to Solomon, Job, the Psalms, Ezra, and Nehemiah, Chronicles, the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, Tobit, Judith, and Esther, all in the order now given.§ There can be no doubt that Jerome was the most competent

* Eichhorn, Einleit. vol. ii. p. 421.

† See Epist. ad Augustin. 71. In Titum, c. 3.

‡ "Pleraque enim prioris laboris fraude cujusdam amisimus." Epist. 79 ad Augustin. Opp. vol. iv. p. 644, ed. Benedict.

§ See Hody, De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, &c. p. 356, et seq.

man of his day for the work in question. He was no novice in translating. He had been exercised in that department. He had been taught Hebrew by learned Jews, of whose assistance he gladly availed himself. Hence he was well acquainted with the exegetical tradition of the Rabbins. He consulted extant translations, and deferred much to them. He followed correct principles. He was familiar with the scenes of Scripture history. And then his industry and carefulness were very great. In short he united in himself more qualifications than any other of his contemporaries. With such mental furniture he produced a work superior to all former versions, both in giving the sense of the original, and in appropriate expressions. The translation of the historical books, especially of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, is remarkably good. So also is that of Job and the minor prophets. But the work was not free from defects. Many circumstances contributed to make it less correct and valuable than it might have been. Jerome had not the benefit of a *pointed text*, which is of great use in shewing the meaning of the original. He was but slightly acquainted with the Arabic and Syriac languages, cognate as they are to the Hebrew and throwing much light upon it. He had also to abide by the established current version of the time as much as possible, so as to avoid offending the prejudices of its admirers. Hence he sometimes corrects his own translation in his commentaries. He could not therefore freely follow his own independent judgment by departing widely from established interpretations. Besides, he proceeded in his work with considerable haste. He did not spend much time over parts of it at least; and perhaps could not do so from the peculiar circumstances he was placed in. Thus we are told by himself:—"Itaque longa aegrotatione fractus, ne penitus hoc anno reticerem, et apud vos mutus essem, *triduí* opus nomini vestro consecravi, interpretationem videlicet trium Salomonis voluminum," &c.* And in another place:—"Quia vicina est

* Praef. in libb. Salomonis.

Chaldaeorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguae peritissimum loquacem reperiens, *unius diei* laborem arripui, et quidquid ille mihi Hebraicis verbis expressit, hoc ego, accito notario, sermonibus Latinis exposui."* We need not therefore be surprised at mistakes in his translation here and there, particularly in the Proverbs.

Notwithstanding the timid and cautious procedure of Jerome, the work excited the opposition of many. An excessive and superstitious veneration for the Septuagint and the *vetus* made from it prevailed at that time, so that any one who departed from them could not hope to escape animadversion. Calumnies were freely uttered against the laborious translator. He was pronounced a heretic. Detraction and opposition befel him. Even Augustine joined partially with his accusers, not daring to go against the stream of popular opinion, though he had at first hailed the work with joy. He advised Jerome not to proceed with it, telling him of a late occurrence in Africa as a warning to desist. A bishop there had introduced the new version into his church; but when the people heard another name given to the gourd of Jonah, they were excited and refused obedience till the old Bible was restored.† The new translation was said to be a falsification of the Word of God. Its departures from the current Greek version and from the old Latin version taken from the Greek, were seized upon as proofs of the danger accruing from the new work. Accordingly it was reserved for the more correct judgment of posterity to appreciate the merits of Jerome as a translator. His contemporaries condemned when they ought to have approved and applauded. The numerous passages in which he alludes to the unjust treatment he met with, have been collected by Van Ess,‡ and form a melancholy exhibition of the unreasonable, injurious prejudices to which good men are exposed in an evil world.

* Praef. in Tobiam. † August. Ep. 88. Opp. iv. 2, 610.
‡ Geschichte der Vulgata, u. s. w. pp. 118-126.

The following paragraph will shew the general deviation of the new translation from the old Latin one current before Jerome :—

The Old Version (Isaiah lii. 13, &c.)

Verse 13. Ecce intelliget puer meus, et exaltabitur, et gloriabitur valde.

14. Sicut stupebunt super te multi, sic ingloria erit ab hominibus species tua, et gloria tua a filiis hominum.

15. Sic mirabuntur gentes multae super eo, et continebunt reges os suum : quia quibus non est annuntiatum de eo, videbunt ; et qui non audierint, intelligent.

Liii. 1. Domine, quis credidit auditui nostro ? et brachium domini cui revelatum est ?

2. Aununtiavimus quasi parvulum in conspectu ejus, sicut radix in terra sitienti : non est species ei neque gloria ; et vidimus eum, et non habebat speciem neque decorem.

3. Sed species ejus inhonorata, et deficiens prae filiis hominum ; homo in plaga, et sciens ferre infirmitatem : quia aversa est facies ejus, despecta et non reputata.

4. Iste peccata nostra portat, et pro nobis dolet ; et nos reputavimus eum esse in dolore, et in plaga, et in afflictione.

5. Ipse autem vulneratus est propter peccata nostra, et infirmatus est propter iniquitates nostras ; disciplina pacis nostrae super eum, livore ejus sanati sumus.

6. Omnes quasi oves erravimus, homo in via sua erravit : et dominus tradidit eum propter iniquitates nostras.

7. Et ipse propter afflictionem non aperuit os suum : sicut ovis

Jerome's Version.

Verse 13. Ecce intelliget servus meus, exaltabitur, et elevabitur, et sublimis erit valde.

14. Sicut obstupuerunt super te multi, sic inglorius erit inter viros aspectus ejus, et forma ejus inter filios hominis.

15. Iste asperget gentes multas, super ipsum continebunt reges os suum ; quia quibus non est narratum de eo, viderunt ; et qui non audierunt, contemplati sunt.

Liii. 1. Quis credidit auditui nostro ? et brachium domini cui revelatum est ?

2. Et ascendet sicut virgultum coram eo, et sicut radix de terra sitienti ; non est species ei, neque decor ; et vidimus eum, et non erat aspectus, et desideravimus eum ;

3. Despectum et novissimum virorum, virum dolorum, et scientem infirmitatem ; et quasi absconditus vultus ejus et despectus, unde nec reputavimus eum.

4. Vere languores nostros ipse tulit, et dolores nostros ipse portavit ; et nos putavimus eum quasi leprosum, et percussum a Deo et humiliatum.

5. Ipse autem vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras, attritus est propter scelera nostra ; disciplina pacis nostrae super eum, et livore ejus sanati sumus.

6. Omnes nos quasi oves erravimus, unusquisque in viam suam declinavit ; et posuit dominus in eo iniquitatem omnium nostrum.

7. Oblatus est, quia ipse voluit et non aperuit os suum ; sicut ovis

The Old Version (Isaiah liii. 1, &c.)	*Jerome's Version.*
ad victimam ductus est, et sicut agnus coram tondente mutus, sic non aperuit os suum.	ad occisionem ducetur, et quasi agnus coram tondente se obmutescet, et non aperiet os suum.
8. In humilitate judicium ejus sublatum est; generationem illius quis enarrabit? quia tollitur de terra vita ejus: ab iniquitatibus populi mei ductus est ad mortem.	8. De angustia et de judicio sublatus est; generationem ejus quis enarrabit; quia abscissus est de terra viventium; propter scelus populi mei percussit eum.
9. Et dabo pessimos pro sepultura ejus, et divites pro morte illius; quia iniquitatem non fecit, neque dolum in ore suo.	9. Et dabit impios pro sepultura, et divitem pro morte sua; eo quod iniquitatem non fecerit, neque dolus fuerit in ore ejus.
10. Et dominus vult mundare eum a plaga; si dederitis pro peccato, anima vestra videbit semen longaevum, et vult dominus.	10. Et dominus voluit conterere eum in infirmitate; si posuerit pro peccato animam suam, videbit semen longaevum, et voluntas domini in manu ejus dirigetur.
11. Auferre de dolore animam ejus, ostendere ei lucem, et formare intelligentiam, justificare justum bene servientem multis: et peccata eorum ipse portabit.	11. Pro eo, quod laboravit anima ejus, videbit et saturabitur; in scientia sua justificabit ipse justus servus meus multos, et iniquitates eorum ipse portabit.
12. Propterea ipse possidebit multos, et fortium dividet spolia, pro eo quod contaminata est in morte anima ejus, et cum iniquis reputatus est: et ipse peccata multorum suscepit, et propter iniquitates eorum traditus est.	12. Ideo dispertiam ei plurimos; et fortium dividet spolia, pro eo, quod tradidit in mortem animam suam, et cum sceleratis reputatus est; et ipse peccata multorum tulit, et pro transgressoribus rogavit.

But there were a few discriminating scholars who perceived the value of Jerome's version, and used it in their own works. Thus they prepared for its general adoption at a subsequent period. To them is due its universal acknowledgment at a later time. We refer to such as Sophronius, who translated the Psalms and Prophets into Greek from the Latin of Jerome; and to Lucian Baeticus, also belonging to the east; in the west, to Joh. Cassian, Prosper of Aquitain, Eucherius of Lyons, Vincent of Lerins, Coelius Sedulius, Claudian Mamertus, Salvian of Marseilles in part, &c.

To Pope Gregory *the Great* it mainly owed its public ecclesiastical reception. He recommended it to the people as

the more faithful, explained the book of Job chiefly from its text, in preference to the older Latin, praised it in his dedicatory epistle to Leander of Seville, and affirmed that the holy see made use of both versions.* Soon after Jerome's was preferred to the older one in Spain; and in the seventh century we learn from Isidore that it was universally adopted there.† Thus the new version came to be adopted gradually and by tacit consent, rather than by the authority of a public synod or decree in its favour. Towards the close of the seventh century, it was freely admitted into all the Latin churches and soon displaced the ancient one.

The custom of many readers to use both versions was very unfavourable to their purity; for when numerous copies began to be required, transcribers *corrected*, as they thought, the one by the other, chiefly however Jerome's by the older. It has been stated by Horne, that Cassiodorus was the principal cause of this confusion, having ordered them to be written in parallel columns, but we have searched in vain for proof of such statement. Interpolations were also made in the Hieronymian version out of various writers who were supposed to have used it; out of liturgical books; and even from Josephus. The increasing ignorance and barbarism of the times contributed greatly to the corruption of the text; the officious, uncritical zeal of half-learned monks correcting and altering freely where it did nothing but corrupt the genuine text.

In this corrupt state the text of the version was found by Charlemagne, who observed the differences in the lessons which were read in the churches. Wishing to restore the

* In Job, lib. xx. cap. 23, and Praef. expos. in Job, ad Leandrum Episcop.

† "De Hebraeo autem in Latinum eloquium tantummodo Hieronymus Presbyter Sacras Scripturas convertit; cujus editione generaliter omnes ecclesiae usquequaque utuntur, pro eo quod veracior sit in sententiis; et clarior in verbis." De divinis officiis, lib. i. cap. 12.

text, he issued repeated orders to the effect that care should be taken to have genuine copies of the Bible throughout the churches. About the year 802 A.D. he entrusted his friend Alcuin with the commission to amend the Old and New Testaments, which was done accordingly. The improved edition was introduced into France, and contains the text which was current in the western church under the title of *the Vulgate* down to the Council of Trent. The work consists of the Old Testament according to the version of Jerome, with the exception of the Psalter and the deutero-canonical books Baruch, Jesus Sirach, Wisdom, the two books of Maccabees, which were derived from the vetus.

It is not easy to ascertain the principles on which Alcuin proceeded in this revision. They do not seem to have been sound and genuine ones. According to Marsh,* he revised the Vulgate from the Hebrew in the Old Testament, and the Greek in the New; but this is very unlikely. Hody † thinks that he made use both of the original languages and the better class of MSS. But we agree with Porson,‡ who thinks that he employed MSS. alone. It is improbable that he knew Greek. Alcuin prefixed the prologues or prefaces of Jerome to the books.

Baronius§ speaks of a copy in the handwriting of Alcuin himself being in the library at Vauxcelles; but Porson justly suspected the MS. as *the original* of Alcuin. A similar MS. (the same?) sometimes called *Charlemagne's Bible*, is now in the British Museum, which, as is alleged, was prepared for the emperor under Alcuin's direction, and was presented to him by his own hand. Sir F. Madden thinks it probable that it was the copy so presented, but doubts whether it was *the auto-*

* Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible, p. 75, ed. 1828. † De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, &c. p. 409.

‡ Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, p. 145.

§ Annales ecclesiast. ad annum 778.

graph of Alcuin himself. He is inclined to believe that it is one of the MSS. prepared by students in the school belonging to the monastery at Tours, and *superintended* by Alcuin.*

The text current in England was as corrupt as that on the continent, and equally needed revision. Hence the task of revising it was undertaken by Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the eleventh century. In the following century (A.D. 1150) Cardinal Nicolaus finding the copies very corrupt (pene quot codices tot exemplaria reperirem), made it his study to amend the text.

In the same century appeared what were termed *Correctoria* or *Epanorthotae*, viz. revised biblical texts with critical remarks in the margin, resembling the Hebrew Masorah. These proceeded from learned or religious associations who got biblical MSS. revised for their use. The person who undertook the revision compared other MSS., preceding *correctoria*, if such there were, the works of the fathers and others, and from these sources noted in the margin of the copy to be revised various readings, with the grounds why he adopted one and rejected another. He also appended other sorts of remarks on peculiarities of language, on interpunction, &c. &c.

The theologians of Paris were the first of the religious corporations which had such a work made. This was followed by the correctorium of Hugo a St. Caro about 1236. Other correctoria of the Dominicans are mentioned. Hug† speaks also of a correctorium of the Carthusian order, relying on a passage of Wilh. Lindanus, but the passage does not justify the existence of such a work.‡ Many of these corrections were condemned by Roger Bacon in his letter to Clement IV.

* Alcuine's Bible in the British Museum, by Sir F. Madden, Knt. 1836, 8vo.

† Introduction to the New Testament translated by Fosdick, p. 278.

‡ Van Ess, Geschichte, u. s. w. p. 164.

He looked on the prevailing evil with the eye of a philosopher. It is certain that they did not contribute to the production or maintenance of a pure text, but rather the contrary; although they were not without value. They were more *exegetical* than *critical*, and had therefore little influence on the text itself. Besides, they were constructed on an erroneous principle; for the makers of them, instead of comparing the oldest and purest of the Alcuinian copies, and applying good critical canons in judging of various readings, consulted some favourite father and adopted his reading of a passage. It is easy to see, how a great number of foreign elements found their way into the version, so that copies differed so greatly from one another as to excite the attention of all who had an opportunity of seeing more than one. Only one correctorium was printed, viz. at Cologne, 1508 8vo, from which Carpzov gave a specimen.*

From this history of the unprinted Vulgate it may be inferred, that the old MSS. had far more variations than are to be seen in any critical edition of the Vulgate afterwards printed; and that the text has passed through so many circumstances as make it a hopeless task to bring it back to what it was at first. It cannot but be corrupt now, whatever be the labour expended in restoring it.

It was not till after the invention of printing that the state of the text appeared in all its confusion. As soon as printed editions came into the hands of readers, it was discovered how much they differed among themselves; and anxieties about the matter were increased when editions were furnished with a number of various readings, and editors complained in their prefaces of the incorrectness of the text as it existed in MSS.

After the invention of printing, the Vulgate issued from the press many times without date and place. It was the first book ever printed. The first *that had a date* was published at Mainz 1462. This was followed by many others, at Rome 1471; Nürnberg 1471, 1475, 1478, 1479, 1480; Piacenza

* Critica Sacra, p. 686.

1475; Paris 1475; Naples 1476; Venice 1475, 1476, &c. all in folio, except that of Piacenza.

The first attempt to give a critical text deserving mention, was made by Cardinal Ximenes, who began in 1502 to improve the Vulgate by a comparison of various MSS., and occasionally the Hebrew and Greek originals. But this edition in the Complutensian Polyglott was far surpassed by that of Robert Estienne or Stephens, who published in 1528 folio an edition of the entire Vulgate, from MSS. and the Complutensian Polyglott. In 1532 appeared another and improved edition, and a third in 8vo in 1534. The fourth edition published in folio, 1540, was much superior to the preceding ones. For it he compared fourteen of the best and oldest MSS. with three printed editions of the Vulgate, whose variations are noted in the margin. The fifth edition appeared in 1545, large 8vo.; the sixth, which is a mere reprint of the fourth, in 1546 folio; the seventh in 1555 8vo, with the division of verses introduced for the first time into the Old Testament as well as the New. This seventh impression was printed at Geneva, whither the learned printer had fled from the persecutions of the Paris theologians, to whom his labours were obnoxious. The eighth edition appeared at Geneva in two vols. folio, 1557, with Vatablus's remarks on the Old Testament and Beza's on the New.

After the Council of Trent had declared the Vulgate *authentic* a new and more correct edition was also prepared by John Hentenius and other Louvain divines, and published in 1547 folio. Old Latin MSS. were collated for it; so that it is an edition of considerable importance. It was several times reprinted, in 1559, 1561, 1563, 1570, 1572, at Antwerp, in various sizes. But the Louvain divines did not rest contented with what they had done at first. They compared new MSS. and issued their chief edition in 1573 at Antwerp, three volumes 8vo and 12mo. Here the readings of their MSS. are marked in the margin, as also the deviations of the Hebrew

text, the Chaldee paraphrases, the Septuagint; and in the New Testament the variations of the Greek text and the Syriac version. The edition was repeated in 1580, 1583, 1587, 1590. It is most important in criticism. But it never obtained ecclesiastical authority generally, though it had a degree of authority for twenty years, till Sixtus V. forbad the collecting of critical materials lest the authenticity of the version should be undermined. After the Sixtine decree critical editions with various readings ceased among Roman Catholics.

The following do not truly belong to a history of the Vulgate, though sometimes given with it:—

In 1542 an edition was published by Isidore Clarius, a Brescian monk, in small folio, at Venice. The title shews its character. "Vulgata editio Veteris et Novi Testamenti, quorum alterum ad Hebraicam, alterum ad Graecam veritatem emendatum est diligentissime, ut nova editio non facile desyderetur, et vetus tamen hic agnoscatur," &c. The text was corrected after the Hebrew and Greek originals. This edition was put in the index of prohibited books at Rome as not exhibiting the text of the Vulgate edition, and with reason.

The editions of Andrew Osiander sen. (1522 Nürnberg) and Luke Osiander (1574-86 Tübingen) who were Protestants, were also corrected so much from the originals as not to exhibit the proper Vulgate. The edition of Paul Eber and George Major, published at Wittenberg in 1565 4to, ten volumes or parts, with Luther's German translation, has the Latin so much altered and interpolated as to present a different version from the Vulgate.

In 1546 the Council of Trent pronounced the Vulgate version *authentic*, and decreed that "hereafter sacred Scripture, but especially this ancient and Vulgate edition itself, shall be printed as accurately as possible."* What was meant by the

* "Insuper eadem sacrosancta synodus considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse ecclesiae Dei, si ex omnibus latinis editionibus

appellation *authentic* has been disputed. It probably signifies no more than that it should be used as *the authorised version* of the Catholic Church in all public lessons, disputations, preachings, and expositions. The most intelligent Romanists explain it to mean a *faithful version* containing nothing contrary to faith and morals, not *infallibly correct.* It was to be *the standard* version of the church, to which appeal should be made and which none should dare to reject.† Roman Catholic writers have tried to shew that the church had no hostility to the Bible in the original tongues when this decree was passed; and that it was not intended to check literary activity in publishing the original text and other ancient versions.‡ But this is by no means apparent. Surely the council knew that by enacting such a decree, free inquiry into the doctrines of the church would be repressed. In elevating this version into the sole and ultimate standard of appeal in all public ecclesiastical matters, the original was certainly depreciated.

It was the intimation given at the end of the decree that stimulated Hentenius and the Louvain divines to prepare after MSS. that new edition which appeared the following year. But we have seen that the Papal see did not adopt or sanction it; but instituted measures of itself for obtaining such an edition of the Bible as the Council of Trent intended. The work was begun under Pius IV. and continued under Pius V.; but it would appear that the theologians to whom the task had been committed did not prosecute it to any great extent.

quae circumferuntur, sacrorum librorum, quaenam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit et declarat, ut haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot saeculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, et in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur, et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat . . . . . decrevit et statuit, ut posthac sacra Scriptura, potissimum vero haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quam emendatissime imprimatur." † Van Ess, § 17, p. 401, et seq.

‡ See Van Ess, Geschichte der Vulgata, 1824.

Sixtus the Fifth applied himself to it with vigour, bringing together a number of learned men to labour at it incessantly. He himself chose the readings to be adopted where there were several in one passage; and read over the printed sheets once at least.* The volume was printed in 1589, but not published till the following year 1590 in folio.† In the papal bull or constitution which begins on the fourth page, the text of the edition is pronounced *the true, legitimate, authentic text;* ‡ and all persons who should presume to alter it are threatened with the indignation of Almighty God §. The entire *constitutio* is given by Van Ess, ‖ and is of a very stringent character.

After the printing of the entire work was finished, Sixtus undertook to read it over again before it should be *published.* This is expressly stated by Angelus Rocca, who had good opportunities of knowing the truth, because he was secretary of the congregation. In this last revision slips of printed paper were pasted over mistakes, containing the right readings; and other errors were corrected with the pen. It is highly probable that a copy thus amended with his own hand was given to the printing-office by Sixtus, with the injunction that no copy should be sent forth without the same corrections. With so many other pressing occupations, and in the short space of two months, as Rocca says, the entire work could not be very accurately revised. The context of the passage already quoted from the preface shews that *the correction of the sheets* is there

* "Novam typographiam exstruximus, ut in ea emendatum jam bibliorum volumen excuderetur; eaque res quo magis incorrupte perficeretur, nostra nos ipsi manu correximus, si qua praelo vitia obrepserunt, et quae confusa, aut facile confundi posse videbantur, ea intervallo scripturae a majoribus notis et interpunctione distinximus."—Praefat.

† Van Ess, p. 266. ‡ "*Vera, legitima, authentica et indubitata.*"

§ "Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum." ‖ P. 269, et seq.

alluded to by Sixtus; not *this final* revision. Copious examples of these corrections are given by James* and Van Ess. They differ of course in different copies.

Soon after it was published the pontiff died, and the discontent with which most of the Romish theologians had received the work found a ready utterance. They endeavoured to suppress the work entirely and substitute a new edition in its stead. Urban VII. who succeeded Sixtus V. lived only twelve days; but after him Gregory XIV. commissioned two of his cardinals to make a new revision of the Vulgate, who with the assistance of various learned men, compared the printed text in the Sixtine edition with the original texts; in the Old Testament with the Septuagint, and with several old Latin MSS. It is surprising that they spent but nineteen days upon the work. Gregory did not live to see it finished; Innocent IX. who lived but two months after his election, seems to have taken no part in it; and Clement VIII. assigned the completion of it to three cardinals, under whose care it was published in 1592 folio, with the two titles, *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae editionis Romae Ex Typographia Apostolica Vaticana* MDXCII.; and, *Biblia Sacra, Vulgatae editionis Sixti Quinti Pontif. Max. jussu recognita atque edita.* This new edition was also declared authentic, and accompanied with similar threats of excommunication against any who should presume to alter its text. Bellarmine prefixed a preface in which however he says nothing of the way followed by himself and his associates in revising the text. It is a very unsatisfactory statement that the text was altered in some places, in others that it was left unchanged, though it needed alteration. It is said in the preface, which is given entire by Van Ess, that Sixtus discovered so many errors of the press in his edition after it was published, that he resolved to recal it and issue a new one. But that being prevented by death from

* Bellum Papale, sive concordia discors Sixti V., &c. Lond. 1600, 4to.

fulfilling his purpose, Gregory XIV. attempted to carry out the intention of Sixtus, but did not live to complete it. Neither did Innocent IX. It was not till Clement VIII. that the work which Sixtus had intended was finished. It is well known however that this transference of the blame to *the printer* was an expedient of Bellarmine's to save the credit of the Sixtine edition. This is admitted by Roman Catholics themselves, by Hug, Herbst, Van Ess. The first says,—"There was however a great difficulty to surmount. Was it expedient to depreciate the Sixtine edition by declaring it faulty? Both the new work and the Papal authority would certainly gain nothing by this in public estimation. Should it be pronounced correct? Why then prepare another? In this dilemma Bellarmine is said to have found out a middle course, and to have proposed that all the blame should be laid upon the printer, so as to vindicate the reputation of Sixtus and his successors. . . . . Bellarmine was the author of the preface, and it is said to have been the cause of his canonization."* In like manner Van Ess does not hesitate to call the assertions of Bellarmine on this point "*lies and pious frauds.*"† When therefore it is alleged by Bellarmine or any other Romanist that the intention of Sixtus was merely fulfilled by his successors, in sending forth a revised edition, the allegation is simply incorrect. An examination of the prefaces and texts in both editions is sufficient to shew that Sixtus never intended a second edition; and that Clement's is a very different impression. Sixtus could not have thought of suppressing his, because after it was printed he took great pains with the text. Now had he designed to cancel the whole, and prepare another in its place, he would not have corrected it with such minute labour. The old and the new edition differ in many places where there was no error of the press in the former. Clauses

* Hug's Introduction translated by Fosdick, p. 281.

† Geschichte der Vulgata, u. s. w. p. 324.

found in the one are omitted in the other. There are additions in the one to the other. They even contradict one another in various passages. They differ in more than two thousand places.

These important diversities between editions issuing from the same infallible see, have not escaped the notice of Protestants, as furnishing a powerful argument against the unerring character of the Romish church. The discrepancies were industriously collected by James,* and Prosper Marchand.† In consequence of the argument thence derived against the popes, Baldwin the Jesuit boldly affirmed that Sixtus's edition was never published.

The few following examples may serve to shew their diversities :—

Exod. xxiii. 18.	. . . . .
Non immolabis super fermento sanguinem victimae *meae.* Ed. Clement.	. . . . . victimae *tuae.* Ed. Sixt.
Exod. xvi. 3.	
Cur *eduxitis* nos in desertum istud. Ed. Clement.	Cur *induxitis* nos, &c. &c. Ed. Sixt.
Numb. xxx. 11.	
Uxor in domo viri *cum se voto constrinxerit et juramento, si audierit vir et tacuerit nec contradixerit sponsioni reddet quodcunque promiserat; sin autem exemplo contradixerit, non tenebitur promissionis rea: quia maritus contradixit et dominus ei propitius erit* si voverit et juramento se constrinxerit. Ed. Clement.	Uxor in domo viri si voverit et juramento se constrinxerit. Ed. Sixt.
Ep. ad. Hebraeos, v. 11.	
Grandis sermo et *ininterpretabilis* ad dicendum. Ed. Clement.	*interpretabilis,* &c. Ed. Sixt.

The Sixtine edition is very scarce, probably because it

* Bellum Papale, sive concordia discors Sixti Quinti, &c. Lond. 1600, 4to.

† In Schelhorn's Amoenitates Litterariae, vol. iv. p. 433, et seq.

was suppressed as much as possible, and because few copies were published.

The text of the Clementine edition approaches to the modern form of it as corrected by Alcuin. Hence in the Old Testament it comes closer to the Hebrew; and resembles the Louvain edition more nearly than any other. There can be little doubt that the corrections were chiefly made from the Louvain theologians.

In this Clementine edition a great number of typographical mistakes were afterwards corrected by printing on them or over them. The pen was also employed in correcting the text.

A list of the most important words and passages so corrected is given by Van Ess, by the side of the corresponding text of the Sixtine edition.*

Looking at this list of mistakes, it can hardly be said that the text of the Clementine is more correct than that of the Sixtine edition. *The later* has almost as many errors which affect the sense as *the earlier* one. It is also certain that the very same errata which appear in the Sixtine have been retained in the Clementine.

Thus it is notoriously contrary to fact when Bellarmine says in the preface that the utmost endeavour was made to print the restored text as accurately as possible (ut *quam emendatissime* imprimeretur). As to the character *of the text itself*, he does not assert its immaculateness. He says in the preface—"alia quae mutanda videbantur, consulto immutata relicta sunt, tum quod ita faciendum esse ad offensionem populorum vitandam," &c. In like manner he writes to Lucas Brugensis (Dec. 6, 1603)—"Scias velim, Biblia Vulgata non esse a nobis accuratissime castigata, multa enim de industria justis de causis pertransivimus, quae correctione indigere videbantur."

In 1593 Clement VIII. published another edition, in 4to, which differs very considerably from the preceding. It vir-

* Geschichte, p. 366, et seq.

tually exhibits a new revision of the text. Bukentop the monk industriously compared it with the edition of 1592. But though it was given out as the most correct, it has an appendix containing many typographical errors. In 1598 a third edition was published in small quarto at Rome from the second Clementine one. It was very carelessly edited, and contains a great number of errata, most of which are enumerated by Van Ess.* It is accompanied however with a *correctorium* to those of 1592, 1593 and itself.

It is astonishing to observe how many differences exist between these three editions. They are considerable in number and importance. They cannot well be regarded as mere typographical errors or trifling mistakes. And if we should be asked which is the *standard* Clementine text, justice and charity require that the edition of 1598 ought to be selected, with its *correctorium*. It is both wrong and unfair to take the impression of 1592 and pass by the two subsequent ones.

In 1599 Moret, who got from Clement the exclusive privilege of printing the authentic Vulgate out of Italy for ten years, issued an edition in 8vo and 4to at Antwerp. This too differs from the Clementine in many places; though the command was, that it should be an exact copy of it.

All subsequent editions take the Clementine text for their basis, chiefly the one of 1598, and are of little importance to the critic. The most convenient manual edition for common use is that published by Leander Van Ess in 8vo, at Tübingen and Leipzig, 1822, 1824, 1835.

The Vulgate consists of the following parts. It is not all Jerome's version from the originals. It is made up of portions belonging to the vetus, to the Hexaplar-Latin version improved by Jerome, and of his own translation made directly from the Hebrew.

To the old Latin belong Baruch, the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, and the two books of Maccabees.

* Geschichte, p. 373, et seq.

To the old Latin corrected by Jerome from the Hexaplar text of the Seventy belongs the Gallican Psalter, but without the obeli and asterisks which he put originally after the example of Origen.

The other books of the Old Testament were translated by Jerome from the Hebrew. The New Testament part is his revision of the vetus from the Greek.

Tobit and Judith he translated in one day by the help of a Jew who gave a Chaldee paraphrase of them, which he put into Latin.

The apocryphal additions to Esther, Daniel, and Jeremiah were retained from the vetus.

This version has been unduly commended by Romanists. Very few of them however professed that it is now or ever absolutely was exempt from error. John Morin himself, although he asserts oftener than once, that the author was a prophet and was guided by a special influence of the Spirit, does not say that he never made a mistake.* Nor do others who speak of the translator being guided by the Spirit hold that he fell into no error. Some indeed assert that the author made no mistakes ; among whom are Titelmann, Lippomann, Grysald, Gretser, Tirinus, and others.† Among the Romanists themselves there has been *a diversity* of opinion about the value of the version. Such as maintained that it was made under the influence of the divine Spirit, or held that the translator had been kept by a singular providence from every error, were the least learned writers of the church, chiefly Spanish monks, who certainly were the more numerous party at the time of the Council of Trent, and afterwards in Spain. Others took a more moderate view, and admitted the existence of mistakes.‡

The version was unjustly depreciated by many of the

* See Hody, p. 445. † See Van Ess, p. 211, note.
‡ Ibid, p. 210, et seq.

older Protestants. Few competent critics will hesitate to admit its value. It is a very ancient witness of *the text* at an early period, as well as of the sense in which it was understood. But it has unfortunately descended to us in a very imperfect state. It has been so much corrupted by various causes, that criticism cannot restore it to its pristine state. There is no ancient document that more needs revision. It ought therefore to be examined and corrected from all ancient sources now available; so that Jerome's own may be separated from later readings. In most cases we fear that this will be a hopeless task, because of the comparative age of the extant MSS. and the early period in which corruptions were introduced. It is certain that the printed copies of the Vulgate do not give Jerome's text in a large number of places; but it is not so easy to prove what he *did* read in them. Nor is it always safe to rely on Jerome's commentaries where they differ from his version, because we know that he did not depart from current interpretations so far as he would have done in other circumstances. He did not always give the translation he preferred in deference to prevailing prejudices. His writings express his real opinion much better than his Latin translation; but we want the text *as he left it;* not as he thought it should be, or as he himself may have elsewhere given it. The text of the Vulgate agrees generally with the Masoretic Hebrew. This was to be expected from the Jewish preceptors of Jerome. In most cases too the marginal Jewish readings have been followed in preference to the textual, as is done by the Jews themselves.

At present it must be used with great caution in correcting the Old Testament text. In some places the collations of Kennicott and De Rossi have confirmed its readings; but it would be a hazardous step to admit a reading into the text on the sole authority of the document. The version however, like most others, is of far more use in an *exegetical* than a *philological* view.

CHAPTER XIX.

REMARKS ON ANCIENT VERSIONS GENERALLY, AND THEIR APPLICATION TO CRITICISM.

It might be supposed beforehand that the ancient versions of the Bible which have come down to our day, would shew the state of the Hebrew text in the early centuries preceding the labours of the Masoretes upon it, and consequently prior to all existing MSS. And they do without doubt render this important service *partially*. Their use in the criticism of the Old Testament is great. We have no other aids of equal value provided they be rightly employed. Yet they do not give *an exact* or *complete* view of the original text as it was at the time of their origin. They do not yield that important service to sacred literature which they might have done.

Had their authors possessed an adequate acquaintance with the Hebrew language, and applied themselves to the task with all the diligence and industry it required, their works would have been of far higher value. But this cannot be said of them. They often mistook the sense through ignorance of Hebrew phraseology. They assigned significations to words from probable conjecture founded on the context or etymology. They were led into mistakes by the similitude of letters, the indistinctness of the writing, or other causes. They frequently translated freely. They paraphrased, or

added explanatory clauses. Sometimes they omitted words and clauses from ignorance of the sense belonging to them, or from accident. They also endeavoured to correct some things which they looked upon as erroneously written in the text before them.

Besides these *original* defects, all ancient versions contain many grievous errors *subsequently introduced.* Much remains to be done in purging them, so as to restore them to their original purity as nearly as possible. They have not been critically sifted and purified. They are still far from being as correctly edited as we could wish. It is not easy to obtain what may be called *a good edition* of each.

The first thing is to procure the best text. The most correct edition of each version should be employed in criticism. But no one edition can be safely relied on, in consequence of the corrupt state they now present. The safest course is to employ more than one edition of each where that is possible, especially those editions which exhibit the best collection of various readings from good MSS.

The next advice to be given is, to consult and employ the text itself of these versions, not the Latin translations by which they may be accompanied. It is well known that a Latin translation is added to the Oriental and Greek versions contained in the Polyglott Bibles. In like manner, Montfaucon has given a Latin version in his edition of the Greek Hexapla. But these Latin translations are not literal or faithful. They should not be trusted, else they will often mislead. The critic should be able to consult the text of a version—the fountain itself—instead of resorting to a translation, which may be turbid when the source is pure. To inexperienced critics the Latin translations may afford some aid; but he who can do without them should not depend on them. Though they proceeded from learned and skilful men, sufficient pains were not bestowed on them.

Again, *primary* versions, *i.e.*, such as were made from the text of the Old Testament itself, furnish the principal sources of criticism. Secondary ones, or such as have been made from other versions, are of very inferior value. They are only applicable remotely. They may be safely neglected by the critic. Whatever utility they afford in purifying the texts of the versions whence they were taken, their value is small in *direct* application to the Hebrew. They bear upon it in an *indirect* mode.

The principal versions of the Old Testament at the service of the critic are, the Septuagint, the fragments of the other Greek translators, the old Syriac or Peshito, the Latin of Jerome, the Targums especially those of Onkelos and Jonathan, and the Arabic of Saadias Haggaon.

The value of these versions depends in part on their antiquity, and in part on the fidelity and literality of their character. The more ancient an interpreter is, the more ancient the codex he employed. But antiquity alone does not determine critical value. *The nature* of the version is of high importance. The nature taken in connexion with antiquity fixes the value.

The oldest of all is the Septuagint. In point of age it holds the foremost place. But it can hardly be called a faithful or excellent version, with the exception perhaps of the Pentateuch. It is often unintelligible or at least obscure.

Next to this, the fragments of the other Greek translators are to be reckoned, chiefly those of Aquila who adhered very closely to the Hebrew text. The old Syriac is generally faithful and simple; but it has not escaped the influence of other versions, particularly the Septuagint. It has been altered after the Hexaplaric text.

The Targums are too paraphrastic. That of Onkelos is the most valuable for criticism. The Latin version of Jerome is very good, giving a fair representation of the Hebrew text in his day; but it has suffered greatly in its transmission to us.

Let us suppose that the critic has procured the text of a version such as it originally stood, as far as the means hitherto employed or the sources within reach can warrant the supposition. He has got it as pure as possible. What then?

Every difference of interpretation in an ancient version must not be accounted as indicating a real or certain variety of reading in the Hebrew text at that time. Many circumstances may have led the translator into error. Hence he may appear to us now to have read differently from the real reading. Ignorance, inadvertence, accident, contributed to the results which his work presents.

Again, allowance must be made for the peculiarities that distinguish each version. Its genius should be perceived before it can be safely and surely applied in criticism. The peculiarities of a translation may be otherwise mistaken for actual varieties of reading. In a great number of cases it is by no means easy to tell with certainty the words which a translator had in the text before him; and when they are discoverable they may be of more use in interpretation than the department now before us. In all versions there are additions to the Hebrew text, from which it should not at once be inferred that the latter is imperfect. There are also omissions which must be put to the account of the translators' own will, not to the redundancy of the Hebrew. Such explanatory clauses and apparent omissions belong to the genius of versions. They constitute some of the peculiarities by which they are distinguished. They arise out of the nature of the versions themselves; or rather they go to form that nature.

A few examples will serve to illustrate these observations. In Gen. iii. 15, the Vulgate translates the Hebrew pronoun הוא by *ipsa*. This mistake however should not be attributed to Jerome himself, but to subsequent corruption of the text of his translation; since we find in his *Hebrew Questions*, "*ipse* conteret," &c. The same version has in Genesis viii. 7,

egrediebatur et non revertebatur, which is quite opposite to the present Hebrew. In xviii. 28, where the Hebrew has *five* the Vulgate expresses *quadraginta quinque.* Where the original has *three thousand* in Exod. xxxii. 28, the Vulgate has *viginta tria millia.* And in the same book, for the Hebrew word *seventy*, the version puts *septuaginta duo* (xxxviii. 29). In all these examples an error must be assumed. It would be unwarrantable to attribute the readings to the Hebrew MS. or MSS. from which Jerome translated. Probably the passages as they now stand in the Clementine editions were altered since the days of the learned monk. A pure text therefore should not exhibit the readings in question. They should be absent from a good edition of the Vulgate.

In Gen. xi. 4 the Hebrew פֶּן *lest* is rendered *antequam.* This is incorrect; but it is likely that it proceeded from Jerome himself. No other Hebrew word was so translated. The present conjunction ought not to be disturbed, though represented by *antequam.*

A few errors in the Septuagint may also be given here. In Gen. xxxi. 7, for "ten *times*," מנים, the Greek has δέκα ἀμνῶν, "ten *lambs.*" Here it is all but certain that μνῶν stood at first in the translation. The translator took the Hebrew word for מָנִים plural of מָנֶה, *a coin*, instead of מנִים *times.* Hence he fell into error.

Psalm lxxxvii. 5. In this place we find μήτης Σιὼν ἐρεῖ. This is simply a mistake. It should be μήτι or μὴ τῇ. The translator did not render it μήτης, as Jerome testifies.

In Psalm xxxiii. 7 God is said to gather the waters of the sea *as an heap*, כנד. Here the Seventy have ὡσεὶ ἀσκόν, *like a bag.* They confounded נֵד and נֹאד. We must not suppose, with Cappell, that they had the latter in the Hebrew text before them.

Again, in Psalm lxxv. 10 the Septuagint has ἀγαλλιάσομαι as the representative of אַגִּיד, *I will declare.* This is not a correct

version; but it must not therefore be inferred that they found אגיל in the text, as Cappell imagines.

In like manner, the mistakes of Onkelos must not be taken for various readings. Thus in Gen. xlix. 5, instead of כְּלֵי חָמָס מְכֵרוֹתֵיהֶם, *instruments of violence are their swords*, the Targum has תוֹתָבוּתְהוֹן *of their sojourn* for the present Hebrew word מְכֵרוֹתֵיהֶם. Here there is some error. It is more likely that Onkelos had the word we now have, in his copy, and failed to perceive that it was Greek, than that he had מְגֻרוֹתֵיהֶם *their habitations*, as Cappell supposes.

In Gen. xlix. 24, we read, "from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel;" but for this Onkelos has, "who by his word nourished *fathers* and *sons*, the seed of Israel." The translator erroneously divided the term אֶבֶן *stone* into the two words אָב and בֵּן.

With respect to Jonathan on the prophets, he renders מַכְשֵׁלָה by מַגְבִּירָה, Isaiah iii. 6. He had the reading ממשלה, which was either in his copy by mistake, or which he erroneously took to be there. In either case, there is no proper various reading. There is merely an error.

In Isaiah iii. 12, Jonathan renders נשים by מָרֵי חוֹבָא. This is an error. He took the word to be נשים instead of נָשִׁים.

In Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch the Hebrew אלון is rendered אוחרן, Gen. xxxv. 8. The translator mistook it for the Greek ἄλλον. In like manner, in Gen. xxxvi. 20, 21, הַחֹרִי is translated גנוסיא. This is a mistake. The translator thought that the Hebrew word was written in the Chaldee form for החרים.

We come to the Peshito for similar examples, and we find in Gen. xlix. 22, that the adverb עלי *upon* is rendered ܣܠܩ *go up*. Here a various reading must not be assumed. The translator made a mistake. In Isaiah xxviii. 26, the representative of יוֹרֶנּוּ is ܢܦܩܢܗܝ, *he praises him*, shewing that the translator took the original word for יוֹדֶנּוּ. Here there is an error.

Sufficient examples have been given to shew that due allowance must be made for errors committed by the translators, or errors subsequently introduced into their works. Various readings may be derived from these versions which do not properly come under that appellation. *The peculiarities* of versions may be mistaken for varieties of reading. Errors may be converted into the same things. Hence arises the necessity of caution and discrimination on this point.

Some critics notwithstanding have recommended, that words which merely exemplify the characteristic features of one or more versions should be admitted into the sacred text, as if they formed an original part of it. To this class belong almost all the Samaritan Pentateuch readings which have been adopted as genuine. And many of the Septuagint varieties are of the same kind. Thus in Exod. vi. 20, after the words, "She bare him Aaron and Moses," the Septuagint adds, "and Miriam their sister." The Samaritan Pentateuch has the same clause, as also the Syriac version, probably through the influence of the Septuagint upon it. But the clause must be rejected. It was not taken from corresponding words in Hebrew by the original copyists of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It was of later origin than the Samaritan text. Similar peculiarities both in the Septuagint and Samaritan frequently occur. They belong *to the nature* of these documents themselves rather than that of *various readings proper* which alone present a fair claim to notice, and are worthy of consideration whether they were at first in the text of the Bible.

After due care has been taken to get at *various readings* properly so called in ancient versions, it may be laid down as a rule, that a reading which they all reject *independently* is incorrect, though it be found in all Hebrew MSS. of the Masoretic recension. This indeed occurs but rarely. Yet there are cases where the thing happens. Thus in Obadiah, 16th verse, the word is תָּמִיד *continually;* whereas in many docu-

ments there is instead סָבִיב *round about.* MSS., with hardly an exception have the latter. But all the ancient versions have the former, and it is the right word. In 2 Chron. x. 14, we read at present אָבִי הִכְבִּיד, *my father made heavy.* But in most MSS., and those the oldest and best, we find, אַכְבִּיד, *I will make heavy.* All the ancient versions, besides many MSS., favour the former. It must therefore be retained.

Again, the true reading may exist in a single version only. This is also a rare case; but examples of it may be found. They should not be increased without extreme caution. In his valuable commentary on the books of Samuel, Thenius has greatly erred on this point. He has assigned excessive weight to one version, viz. the Septuagint. As a *right* instance of the rule we take 1 Sam. xxv. 1, where occurs the word פָּארָן, for which the Greek version has Μαων. Looking at the circumstances of the case, and the context, it is tolerably certain that the Septuagint is right. Hence the Hebrew should have מָעוֹן, *Maon.* It is fortunate that we are not left to the guidance of a single version. In nearly all cases several are available for the purposes of criticism. Here however the difficulty of deciding rightly is felt. When the ancient versions disagree in testimony, which of two or more readings should be preferred? How should we fix upon the true one?

Ceteris paribus, the majority should determine. But *mere majority* can hardly be a safe criterion. *The character* of the witnesses must be consulted, as well as their number. Above all, *adaptation of context* should be looked at. The mode in which each reading *affects the sense* is of primary importance.

We may select as an example Jerem. li. 19, "He is the former of all things and the rod of his inheritance." Here the Vulgate has, "et Israel sceptrum hereditatis ejus." The Chaldee also has *Israel.* Other versions want it. The parallel in x. 16 has the same word in the text. Amid such diversity

of testimony, we cannot follow the Vulgate and Chaldee paraphrase, and say that the true reading is with *Israel* in the text. *Israel* must be supplied indeed in translating the passage, as the context clearly points out; and accordingly our modern versions, intent upon the sense, do supply it; but it is another thing to infer that *Israel* stood at first in the Hebrew text. The probabilities are all against its originality.

But we are never shut up to the testimony of versions alone. If we were, it would be very difficult to decide on the comparative value of conflicting readings. We should be at a loss which to prefer.

When a reading supported by ancient translations has the concurrence of Hebrew MSS. it is of great weight. The greater the number of *different* witnesses to any various reading, the more strength belongs to the united evidence. This is especially the case if there be no room for suspecting mutual correction on the part of the versions presenting the same reading; and if the Hebrew codices have undergone no change derived from the ancient versions, or *vice versa.*

Of course, the greater the number of MSS. supporting a reading of the ancient versions, the greater is its authority. When *all* MSS. agree, the value of it becomes very high. And if to MSS. be added the testimony of other sources of emendation, the authority of the reading is increased. In this manner it may be supported by all sources of emendation except one, when it is certainly the true reading, unless the remaining source against it have strong circumstances in its favour, or be attended with such peculiarities as are sufficient to overbalance the mass of external evidence.

CHAPTER XX.

PARALLELS OR REPEATED PASSAGES.

CERTAIN sections, longer or shorter, are repeated in the Bible, which have given rise to various readings, and are a mean of discovering and correcting mistakes which have got into the text. These may be divided into three classes.

I. Historical sections repeated.

II. Laws, poems or odes and oracles, which appear twice.

III. Sentiments, propositions, proverbs, &c. which are repeated.

I. To this head belong *genealogies* such as,

Genesis	v. 3-32	compare	1 Chron.	i. 1-4.
	x. 2-4	,,	,,	i. 5-7.
	x. 8, 13-18	,,	,,	i. 8-16.
	x. 22-29	,,	,,	i. 17-23.
	xi. 10-26	,,	,,	i. 24-27.
	xxv. 2-4	,,	,,	i. 32, 33.
	xxv. 13-16	,,	,,	i. 29-31.
	xxxvi. 10-14	,,	,,	i. 35-37.
	xxxvi. 20-28	,,	,,	i. 38-42.
	xxxvi. 31-39	,,	,,	i. 43-50.
	xxxvi. 40-43	,,	,,	i. 51-54.
2 Sam.	xxiii. 8-39	,,	,,	xi. 10-47.
Ezra	ii. 1-70	,,	Nehem.	vii. 6-73.

In like manner narratives belong here, such as, a considerable part of Genesis, and the following :—

1 Sam. xxxi. 1-13	compare	1 Chron.	x. 1-12.
2 Sam. v. 1-3	„	„	xi. 1-3.
v. 17-25	„	„	xiv. 8-16.
vi. 1-11	„	„	xiii. 5-14.
vi. 12-16	„	„	xv. 25-29.
vi. 17-19	„	„	xvi. 1-3.
vii. 1-29	„	„	xvii. 1-27.
viii. 1-18	„	„	xviii. 1-17.
x. 1-19	„	„	xix. 1-19.
xi. 1 ; xii. 30, 31	„	„	xx. 1-3.
xxi. 18-22	„	„	xx. 4-8.
xxiv. 1-25	„	„	xxi. 1-27.
1 Kings iii. 5-13	„	2 Chron.	i. 7-12.
vi. 1-3	„	„	iii. 1-4.
vi. 19-28	„	„	iii. 8-13.
vii. 15-22	„	„	iii. 15-17.
vii. 23-26	„	„	iv. 2-5.
vii. 38-51	„	„	iv. 6 ; v. 1.
viii. 1-11	„	„	v. 2-14.
viii. 12-50	„	„	vi. 1-39.
viii. 62-66	„	„	vii. 4-10.
ix. 1-9	„	„	vii. 11-22.
ix. 10-23	„	„	viii. 1-10.
ix. 26-28	„	„	viii. 17, 18.
x. 1-29	„	„	ix. 1-28.
xii. 1-19	„	„	x. 1-19.
xii. 21-24	„	„	xi. 1-4.
xiv. 21, 29-31	„	„	xii. 13-16.
xv. 1, 2, 7, 8	„	„	xiii. 1, 2, 21, 23.
xv. 9-15	„	„	xiv. 1-3, 16-18.
xv. 16-24	„	„	xvi. 1-6, 11-14.
xxii. 2-35	„	„	xviii. 1-34.
xxii. 41-50	„	„	xx. 31-37 ; xxi. 1.
2 Kings viii. 16-24	„	„	xxi. 5-10, 19, 20.
viii. 25-29	„	„	xxii. 1-6.
xi. 1-3	„	„	xxii. 10-12.
xi. 4-40	„	„	xxiii. 1-21.
xi. 21 ; xii. 21	„	„	xxiv. 1-27.
xiv. 1-6	„	„	xxv. 1-4.
xiv. 8-14, 17-20	„	„	xxv. 17-28.
xiv. 21, 22 ; xv. 2-7	„	„	xxvi. 1-4, 21-23.
xv. 32-38	„	„	xxvii. 1-9.
xvi. 1-20	„	„	xxviii. 1-27.

2 Kings	xviii. 1-3	compare	2 Chron.	xxix. 1, 2.
	xviii. 13, 17-37	„	Isaiah	xxxvi. 1-22.
	xix. 1-37	„	„	xxxvii. 1-38; 2 Chron. xxxii. 1-21.
	xx. 1-11	„	„	xxxviii. 1-8.
	xx. 12-21	„	„	xxxix. 1-8; 2 Chron. xxxii. 24-33.
	xxi. 1-9	„	2 Chron.	xxxiii. 1-9.
	xxi. 17-26	„	„	xxxiii. 18-25.
	xxii. 1-20	„	„	xxxiv. 1-28.
	xxxiii. 1-3	„	„	xxxiv. 29-32.
	xxxiii. 21-23	„	„	xxxv. 1, 17-19.
	xxiii. 29, 30	„	„	xxxv. 20-24; xxxvi. 1.
	xxiii. 30-37; xxiv. 1-6	„	„	xxxvi. 2-8.
	xxiv. 8-17	„	„	xxxvi. 9, 10.
	xxxiv. 18-20; xxv. 1-30	„	Jerem.	lii. 9, 10; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 11-21.
2 Chron.	xxxvi. 22, 23	„	Ezra	i. 1-3.

II. Laws, poems and oracles, which appear twice :—

Exodus	xx. 2-17	compare	Deuteron.	v. 6-21.
Levit.	xi. 2-19	„	„	xiv. 4-18.
Psalm	xviii. 2-50	„	2 Sam.	xxii. 1-51.
	cv. 1-15	„	1 Chron.	xvi. 8-22.
	xcvi. 1-13	„	„	xvi. 23-33.
	cvi. 47, 48	„	„	xvi. 35, 36.
	xiv. 1-7	„	Psalm	liii. 1-6.
	xl. 13-17	„	„	lxx. 1-5.
	lvii. 7-11	„	„	cviii. 1-5.
	lx. 5-12	„	„	cviii. 6-13.
	lxxx. 3, 7, 19	„	„	cvii. 8, 15, 21, 31.
	cxv. 4-8	„	„	cxxxv. 15-18.
Isaiah	ii. 2-4.	„	Micah	iv. 1-3.
	xv. 5	„	Jerem.	xlviii. 5.
	xvi. 6, 7	„	„	xlviii. 29-31.
	xxiv. 17, 18	„	„	xlviii. 43, 44.
	lii. 7	„	Nahum	i. 15.
Jerem.	x. 25	„	Psalm	lxxix. 6, 7.
	xxvi. 18	„	Micah	iii. 12.
	xlix. 14-16	„	Obadiah	i. 4.
	xlix. 27	„	Amos	i. 4.
Habbak.	iii. 18, 19	„	Psalm	xviii. 33.
Zeph.	ii. 14	„	Isaiah	xlvii. 8.

III. Sentences, propositions, and proverbs are repeated, as—

Numb. xxiv. 3, 4	compare	Numb. xxiv. 15, 16.
xxiv. 9	„	Gen. xlix. 9 ; xxvii. 29.
Isaiah v. 25	„	Isaiah ix. 12, 17, 21 ; x. 4.
xxxv. 10	„	„ li. 11.
Jerem. ii. 28	„	Jerem. xi. 13.
vii. 30, 31	„	„ xxii. 34, 35.
vii. 33	„	„ xvi. 4 ; xix. 7 ; xxxiv. 20.
vii. 34	„	„ xvi. 9 ; xxv. 10.
xv. 2	„	„ xliii. 11.
xv. 13, 14	„	„ xvii. 3, 4.
xxi. 19	„	„ xxxviii. 2.
xxiii. 5, 6	„	„ xxxiii. 15, 16.
xxxiii. 7, 8	„	„ xvi. 14, 15.
xxix. 5	„	„ xxix. 28.
xxx. 10, 11	„	„ xlvi. 27, 28.
xlviii. 40, 41	„	„ xlix. 22.
xlix. 19-21	„	„ l. 44-46.
Ezekiel i. 15-21	„	Ezekiel x. 8-17.
iii. 17-19	„	„ xxxiii. 7-9.
xi. 18-20	„	„ xxxvi. 25-28.
xviii. 25	„	„ xviii. 29 ; xxxiii. 17-20.
Habbak. ii. 8	„	Habbak. ii. 27.
Zech. iv. 5	„	Zech. iv. 13.
Prov. viii. 8	„	Prov. xx. 22.
xx. 16	„	„ xxvii. 13.
xxi. 9	„	„ xxv. 24.
xxii. 3	„	„ xxvii. 12.

There can be no doubt that these parallels have given rise to many various readings, as Cappell long ago endeavoured to shew.* But they did not cause so much corruption in the text, as either he or his editor Vogel supposed. And in using them as sources for correcting the text, greater caution must be applied than such critics as Kennicott and Eichhorn employed. It is a most difficult problem to handle them properly. In all departments of sacred criticism but here specially, care should be taken not to meddle with what is already right.

* Critica Sacra, vol. i. cap. iii. ed. Vogel.

The first thing to be observed is, whether both parallels proceed from the same writer. In several instances the sacred authors repeated the same things, either in the same book, or in different treatises. At other times later writers imitated the sentiments and adopted the language of earlier ones. They reproduced statements in similar phraseology. In both cases it is unreasonable to bind down the writers to the very same phraseology. The Old Testament authors were not thus constrained by the influences operating on their minds. They were allowed much of the freedom of ordinary authors, who vary their expressions at different times and under different circumstances, even when they give utterance to the same ideas. In like manner, one writer did not think it necessary to copy another. He *imitated* him, without being an exact or slavish *copyist.* Hence care must be taken not to reduce parallels in the same writer, or in different ones, to absolute uniformity, without a very strong reason for imagining that originally they wrote certain passages *exactly alike.*

Unfortunately, transcribers often proceeded on the erroneous assumption that many parallels were originally alike, and corrected accordingly. This is the reason why so many varieties of reading now occur in them, in MSS. and in versions. So great corruption has been introduced, that the difficulty of restoring various places to their pristine state is very considerable at the present day.

It has been propounded as a rule, that in such passages as those enumerated above, where there is a difference in numbers or names, the text is erroneous, and ought to be corrected. But the rule is apt to mislead. It does not hold good in many cases. Persons and places may have often had two names, one of them being used by one writer, and the other by another; or even both being employed by the same writer at different times. It is certain that this was the case. Thus Jacob and Israel, Edom and Esau, Jethro and Hobab, Gideon

and Jerubbaal were names belonging to the same persons. In like manner, Daniel one of the sons of David (1 Chron. iii. 1) is called Chileab (2 Sam. iii. 3). Amminadab (1 Chron. vi. 22) is termed Izhar (1 Chron. vi. 2). Uriel and Zephaniah are appellations of the same person (1 Chron. vi. 24, 36). Jediael (1 Chron. vii. 6) is called Ashbel (Gen. xlvi. 21). In 1 Chron. xi. 29, Ilai is identical with Zalmon in 2 Sam. xxiii. 28. So also Hashem (1 Chron. xi. 34) is called Jashen (2 Sam. xxiii. 32).* Thus wherever a person or place had two appellations, the critic or transcriber correcting the one by the other mistook the fact, and corrupted the text. Even in the case of numbers, the same mistake has been committed; for unless both numbers be applied exactly to the same things, and be meant to include objects precisely identical, they may have properly stood differently in the original text. Thus in 2 Sam. xxiv. 13, we have *seven years of famine;* whereas in 1 Chron. xxi. 11, there are but *three years' famine.* The Greek translator, thinking them irreconcileable, made both alike, by reading *three* in both places. But it appears from 2 Sam. xxi. 1, that there had already been a famine of three years; and the prophet asks in the former place, "shall seven years' famine" (*i. e.* three in addition to the three that had been already, with the present year included) "come unto thee in thy land?"

Another rule has been proposed in relation to this subject which is also fallacious. It has been said, that where there is more than a verbal difference in records of the same transaction, the text is erroneous and ought to be corrected. But there may be and doubtless are important differences in records of the same transaction, where the text is right in both instances. *Contradictions* there cannot be perhaps without corruption in the text; but the same event or transaction may be described from various points of view, and with various pur-

* Cappelli Crit. Sac. vol. i. pp. 99, 100, ed. Vogel.

poses, giving rise to more than *verbal* differences, while the writers are honest, truthful, and correct in every particular.

It has been farther alleged, that when there is even a verbal difference in copies of the same prayer or speech in the printed text, it ought to be corrected. This rule is as little to be relied upon as the rest; for there may be and are exceptions to it which render its application of no use. It is true that the same prayer or speech spoken but once by the same person consisted of certain words and *none other;* but it is still to be considered whether a sacred writer were prompted to utter the *ipsissima verba* the second time, or thought it necessary to do so when he gave the message or speech twice over. Did he not, at least occasionally, express *the meaning* of the speech or prayer, producing it in *substance* and *sense*, without the very terms in which it was clothed by the speaker? We think it adventurous, as well as unreasonable, to confine the sacred writers within the strict enclosure of the rule given; especially as there are examples indicating that they did not act so in point of fact. Thus Moses, in repeating the Decalogue, did not give the very words before expressed. The reasons annexed to the various commandments are not identical in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy and in the twentieth of Exodus. The words of *the commandments themselves strictly so called*, are not always the same; nor should they be corrected to make them so.

The condition appended to the three rules now stated does not recommend them to general adoption, viz. that the differences occur in the printed text, and not in MSS. or versions. The condition is too vague to be of much use. From how many MSS. and versions must the differences in question be absent? From all? From some? From a few? If from all, there is more probability that the text is erroneous, but there is not *certainty*, because all existing MSS. are comparatively recent, and versions themselves have descended to us

in a corrupt state. There are errors which none of them touches or alludes to—errors palpable to the most cursory reader. Hence it does not follow, that because a printed passage presents one form, and all known MSS. and versions another, it is necessarily erroneous. *Many* circumstances must be taken into account before a correct judgment can be formed.

With regard to these parallel passages or repetitions, we are satisfied that no general rule can be laid down. The common principles of criticism must be carried into them; but each one has a specialty about it that modifies those principles. It needs to be looked at in its object and origin, in the bearing of its readings, its relation to the context, and the general nature of the book to which it belongs. Hence every parallel place calls for a special criticism. Special rules arise out of itself. Thus prose parallels in historical books should be treated somewhat differently from poetic parallels in other kinds of composition.

A few examples will shew the improper way in which many critics have acted in relation to parallels; and the extreme caution necessary to be observed in each separate case. On comparing the eighteenth Psalm with the twenty-second chapter of the second book of Samuel, there are many verbal differences—nearly one hundred and thirty. Here *transcribers* are blamed for the most part. Many of them, it is said, are plain corruptions; and many are removed by the authority of MSS. Yet all are not set down to their account; for Eichhorn gives a long list where *designed* alterations appear, and is in doubt whether they belong to David himself or to a contemporary.* But the line drawn between the differences belonging to transcribers, and to David himself is an imaginary one. Design may be traced throughout. Nor can any reason be given for believing that many of them have been owing to

* Einleitung, vol. i. p. 404.

copyists and critics. In 2 Sam. xxii. 11, the Masoretic text has ויראה, "*And he was seen* upon the wings of the wind;" whereas the Psalm has וידא "*He did fly.*" The former is pronounced flat and wrong by Gerard.* But the reading may be suitable. It refers to *the appearing* of God in contrast with *his concealment* in the heavens.

Again, in 2 Sam. xxii. 12, "He made darkness . . . . . pavilions round about him;" which is pronounced defective in metre, and so written as if something were wanting. The Psalm has "darkness *his secret place* (סִתְרוֹ), his pavilion dark waters. But though סִתְרוֹ be wanting in 2 Samuel, and סֻכּוֹת stands there for סֻכָּתוֹ, the abbreviation was intentional and the metre is complete.

In 2 Sam. xxii. 13, we read, "Through the brightness that was before him," which is also pronounced defective in metre. The Psalm has, "his thick clouds passed," which is declared to be right. But the sense is complete in 2 Samuel; for there we read, "out of the brightness before him coals of fire burned." The variation is too great to be explained otherwise than by design. The Psalm has immediately after "hailstones and coals of fire." This is pronounced abrupt; and 2 Samuel, where we read, "they were kindled into coals of fire," is declared to be right. But the clause "hailstones and coals of fire," stands as an exclamation. In the thirteenth verse of the Psalm an irregularity has been found, because there are three hemistichs. Hence the last, "hailstones and coals of fire," is reckoned improper, and thought to be taken from the preceding verse; especially as a few MSS. with the Septuagint and Old Latin versions omit the clause. But the hemistich depends on the verb יִתֵּן, and is quite appropriate, as may be seen by comparing it with Exod. ix. 23. "The repetition," says Hengstenberg, "is the more in its place, as the coals of fire, or the lightning and the hail, are the very things by

* Institutes of Biblical Criticism, p. 149.

which the enemies of the Psalmist were annihilated; the rest were but the circumstantials which rendered the annihilation scene more frightful."*

In Psalm xviii. 16 we now read, מִגַּעֲרָתְךָ יְהוָה מִנִּשְׁמַת רוּחַ אַפֶּךָ. In 2 Sam. xxii. 16 the corresponding clause is בְּגַעֲרַת יְהוָה מִנִּשְׁמַת רוּחַ אַפּוֹ. Here Vogel† boldly asserts that one text or the other has been changed; that of the Psalm as he conjectures. The suffix ךָ is arbitrarily appended to the word בְּגַעֲרַת or מִגַּעֲרַת, and then אַפּוֹ, as the connexion seems to require, is made אַפֶּךָ. Now it is all but certain that the texts are correct in both cases; though they proceed from the one writer. In the Psalm, there is a sudden transition from the third person to the second, as is suited to the nature of poetry; but in the book of Samuel the address to Jehovah is laid aside in conformity with the context before and after. On examining all the various readings in Psalm xviii. and 2 Sam. xxii. it appears to us that the one should not be corrected by the other, and least of all, the former by the latter. The former was the original, the latter a later revision by David himself. In like manner the variations of Psalms xiv. and liii. belong to David himself, not to transcribers nor to the compilers of the books. The one should not therefore be corrected by the other.

In the case of 2 Kings xviii. 13—xx. 19, and Isaiah xxxvi.-xxxix, the one section has been copied from the other. Which is the original we need not now investigate, as Gesenius has done it with much skill and ability.‡ It is therefore unreasonable to suppose that exact verbal agreement should be found between them. There are omissions, abbreviations, additions, and alterations, which shew that the later writer did not implicitly and minutely copy his predecessor. All admit this. But in their present texts occasional corrections

* Commentary on the Psalms, vol. i. p. 301, English translation.

† Ad Cappelli Crit. Sac. vol. i. p. 49.

‡ Commentar ueber den Jesaia, vol. ii. p. 932, et seq.

have been made by Houbigant, Lowth, and other critics, on the ground that several words occur which make no sense, or at least a sense not adapted to the context. Finding that by a little alteration arising from similarity of letters in form and sound, the same words might easily pass into others suited to the connexion, and that ancient versions seem to have read the same word in both places, Lowth and others have inferred that the words were originally identical in both parallels, and have corrected one text accordingly. But they have proceeded rashly and unwarrantably. The proposed emendations or conjectures have not commended themselves to the best critics. Nor ought they. They are blundering and unsuccessful attempts. There is nothing against the supposition that the same words may have stood originally in both parallels—and it is quite reasonable to think that a word giving no sense, or one quite inappropriate to the context, should be changed into another especially when ancient versions point to another—but Lowth has often proceeded on the assumption that a word gives no sense where it does; or that it is *unsuitable* where it is *appropriate.* He has not been cautious at first, and therefore he has attempted to amend what needs no correction. Thus in Isaiah xxxvi. 7, we read וְכִי־תֹאמַר; whereas in 2 Kings xviii. 22 it is וְכִי תֹאמְרוּן. And because the latter is more suitable than the former, both have been made alike; the supposed corruption being charged to the account of transcribers. This is favoured by the fact that two ancient MSS. have the singular verb of Isaiah in the plural; and so the Septuagint and Chaldee versions.* But all this forms no good reason for inferring that at first the verb was the same in both places. As the singular verb now stands in Isaiah, and the plural verb in 2 Kings, they were originally. No change has passed over them. In the same way Micah has repeated the prophecy contained in Isaiah ii. 2-4, with a few

* See Lowth's Note on Isaiah xxxvi. 7.

variations. There is no presumption that he intended to use the same words as his predecessor, and therefore there is no reason for correcting either. But Lowth and Houbigant have attempted to do so. Isaiah has עמים, Micah has גוים. Isaiah has ונשא, Micah ונשא הוא. Isaiah has כל הגוים, Micah עמים. Isaiah has לעמים רבים "many peoples;" Micah, עצמים לגוים עד רחוק, "strong nations from afar." We must not revise the one text by means of the other; or bring them by force into exact conformity.

On the whole, we feel confident that the number of parallels originally the same in words, is not so great as is commonly supposed. Speaking generally, one writer did not commonly repeat himself in so many words; nor did a writer copy another exactly. There must be some necessity for making two passages exactly agree. It will not do to infer corruption in one of them without weighty authority either external or internal to justify the inference. When the sense is manifestly contradictory, there must be corruption. That is the only absolute canon which can be laid down.

Other canons have been furnished by Houbigant which cannot be received. In correcting parallels, he says that the emendation should be guided by the passage where the transaction is more fully narrated. But the reverse would oftener agree with reality. The rule therefore is more liable to mislead than to guide rightly. Again, the same critic affirms, that in correcting parallels the emendation should be guided by the passage with which others in Scripture are more accordant. Here there is a vagueness which renders the rule of little value. As far as it appears of any practical utility, it is also liable to mislead. For the more difficult reading is likely to be the true one; and transcribers often tried to make such readings easier by conforming them to other places. The converse of the canon is as often true as the canon itself.

De Rossi propounded another rule. When two passages

are really parallel, and present varieties sanctioned by MS. authority, the reading of the first writer and the more ancient book should be preferred. But who does not know that the later writer of the two generally departed in some particulars from the earlier? And is any one so ignorant as to assume, that transcribers could not have as readily erred in copying the earlier as the later work?

As to *the rule* that when one reading might have arisen from the other by a natural mistake it should be adopted as authentic, it can scarcely claim the character, or maintain the authority of one. *Along with other things*, it is a consideration not to be overlooked, and we follow it in certain circumstances; but much seldomer than other critics have done.

Nor will it do to rely on the consideration, that when one reading is contradicted by copies or versions, it must be corrected by the parallel one; because internal evidence may suffice *of itself* to shew that they were originally different. So also external evidence alone may prove the original dissimilarity of two passages. And the converse is equally true. Internal evidence may of itself suffice to shew that two passages were originally alike; but it must be urgent and palpable. So with regard to external evidence alone. But in all cases where one kind of evidence is relied on, it must be palpable and weighty. It must press itself on the observation even of the less discerning critic.

We believe that the present source of emendation is a legitimate and useful one, but it ought not to be pressed too far, as it has often been. In some hands it becomes dangerous. The judicious critic will manage it with *extreme* vigilance; but the innovator and the novice will employ it in doing injury to the text. The books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah need its application greatly. The Pentateuch too may be benefited by it. The prophetical writings and the Psalms may also gain from its operation; though in a much

less degree. But the Chronicles as compared with other books urgently demand its aid. Their text will be purified and corrected by means of it. Let it be first considered in all cases where the writers may be supposed to have consulted public or private records, genealogical registers, anthologies, or annals; whether they simply followed the sources before them; or whether they made them exact and accurate at the time of using them. The point deserves attention *before* a reforming hand be applied.

CHAPTER XXI.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.

ANOTHER source of emendation is that which consists of quotations in the New Testament from the Old.

There are many such citations, which have been the cause of varieties in the text, and may be employed to correct it.

The New Testament writers usually quote from the Septuagint version, not from the Hebrew itself. Hence their citations are of more use in amending the text of that version than the original Hebrew.

These citations might be divided into the following classes :—

1. Such as exactly agree with the Greek version, comprehending—
   (*a.*) Those which agree exactly with the Septuagint where it literally corresponds with the Hebrew ; and
   (*b.*) Those agreeing exactly with the Septuagint where it slightly deviates from the Hebrew.
2. Citations taken from the Greek version with slight variations.
3. Quotations taken from the same source, where it differs considerably or materially from the Hebrew.
4. Citations agreeing exactly with the Hebrew where it does not strictly correspond to the Greek.

5. Citations made from the Hebrew rather than the Greek.
6. Quotations agreeing neither with the Hebrew nor the Greek.

In the case of 1 (*a.*) there is nothing to be looked for in the way of amending the Hebrew, because it is right. The same may be said of 1 (*b.*), where it were idle to suspect the Hebrew corrupted, when the character of the Septuagint is so well known.

In the case of No. 2 no emendation is required, because the New Testament writers making immaterial changes in the text of the Septuagint had not regard to the original in so doing.

In the case of No. 3 it may be supposed that criticism will reap advantage. The Greek translators, where they differ considerably or materially from the present Hebrew text and are followed by the New Testament, *may have had* a Hebrew text before them varying from the Masoretic one; but an examinatian of the passages belonging here will shew, that in *very few* cases can this be inferred. We doubt whether it could be *proved* in a single instance.

In relation to No. 4 emendation is out of the question. So too with No. 5.

As to No. 6, criticism may perhaps use them with profit.

The source of emendation before us has been abused. It has been applied where it should not. Its importance has been over-estimated. We are persuaded that very few corruptions of the Hebrew text can be detected by its means; and that very few can be corrected by it. *Practically* it is of little value. Many circumstances conspire to render it so. The text of the Septuagint is at present in an incurably corrupt state. Hence criticism must employ it, directly or indirectly, with extreme caution. And then the New Testament writers quoting from it were satisfied with it if it gave the sense. They did not care much about *the letter* of Scripture. They were intent on

the general sense of a passage, and not the *ipsissima verba.** Besides, it is by no means likely that they made their quotations with the Septuagint version before them. In some cases they may have done so; but not generally. Familiarity with the Greek version led them to trust to memory. They cited from recollection.

It is natural to suppose, that where the Greek did not give the sense, the New Testament writers resorted to the Hebrew. Then only did they quote from it. But they did not bind themselves to a literal rendering of the Hebrew words. They gave the sense correctly, which was all they wanted. Besides, the text of the Greek Testament itself in many cited passages presents diversities of reading—a fact which adds to the difficulty of amending the Hebrew text from the source before us. These and other circumstances detract much from the utility of quotations in criticism. But they have not had their due weight and proper influence allowed them. They have been much neglected; and therefore critics have set about correcting the Hebrew where it needs no correction. Perhaps an example or two may serve to put the reader more plainly in possession of the thing asserted. In the following passages, we are told that the Hebrew appears to be corrupted.

Micah v. 2	compared with	Matth. ii. 6.
Malachi iii. 1	,,	Matth. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke vii. 27.
Psalm xvi. 8-11	,,	Acts ii. 25-28.
Amos ix. 11, 12	,,	Acts xv. 16, 17.
Psalm xl. 7-9	,,	Heb. x. 5-7.
Habbak. ii. 3, 4	,,	Heb. x. 37, 38.

Matth. ii. 6.—This quotation does not exactly agree either with the Seventy or the Hebrew. The Septuagint coincides

* "Ex quibus perspicuum est, apostolos et evangelistas in interpretatione veterum scripturarum sensum quaessisse, non verba: nec magnopere de ordine sermonibusque curasse, dum intellectui res pateret."—Hieronymus, ep. 47 ad Pammach.

more nearly with the Hebrew than with the words of Matthew. The negative particle is wanting in both. Some think that the negative particle μή originally belonged to the Greek version, thus preparing the way for another assumption, viz., that the negative לא originally belonged to the Hebrew, which having been dropped, the Greek version was altered accordingly. It is quite arbitrary to suppose that the negative belonged originally to the Hebrew text. The passage should be read interrogatively: "And art thou Bethlehem-Ephratah little among the thousands of Judah? Out of thee shall come forth to me one who is to be ruler in Israel." The question proposed by the prophet is answered by the evangelist in the negative.

Malachi iii. 1 is supposed to be corrupt in consequence of Matth. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke vii. 27.

Here the Hebrew text has been followed, but not closely. The chief difference between the citation and its original in the Old Testament is the change of person from the first to the second. In this respect it is at variance both with the Hebrew and the Septuagint. "There is great reason to suspect," says Dr. H. Owen, "that the Hebrew was first corrupted, and that the Greek was afterwards adjusted to it."* But there is no reason whatever to suspect corruption. Though the person be different in the Hebrew and the evangelists, the sense is the same. Because a different person is introduced as speaking, there must be a corresponding variance; but that does not affect the meaning.

Acts ii. 25-28.—This quotation agrees with the Septuagint and was taken from it. But it differs from the Hebrew in various respects. Yet these differences do not alter the sense. The general meaning is the same. As to the singular number *thy holy one*, corresponding to the plural *holy ones* in

* The modes of quotation used by the evangelical writers explained and vindicated, p. 34.

the Masoretic text, it is likely from the nature of the evidence that the singular stood in the Hebrew text. There is no ground for thinking that שֹׂבַע was at first אֶשְׂבַּע, which the Septuagint translated according to the sense, and which Luke gives πλησθήσεις με.

Amos ix. 11, 12 quoted in Acts xv. 16, 17.

This passage is quoted by Luke from the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew. But on comparing the citation with the original, one clause is very different, viz.—ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *that the residue of men may seek after the Lord;* for which the Masoretic text has יִירְשׁוּ אֱדוֹם שְׁאֵרִית־אֶת לְמַעַן. The Septuagint and New Testament coincide here. Hence we must suppose that the Hebrew has been corrupted since the Septuagint was made, or else the Greek version has been adapted to the New Testament reading. The former is more probable. The Hebrew had at first ידרשו not יירשו; and אדם not אדום. For את stood אותי, or perhaps אתי, the *yod* being an abbreviation of יהוה. It is remarkable that no Hebrew MSS. give these readings.

Psalm xl. 7-9, quoted in epistle to the Hebrews x. 5-7.

In another work,* this quotation has been fully examined, and it has been shewn that the sense is substantially the same as the present Hebrew text. There is no good reason for believing that the Hebrew text was otherwise at first. There is no corruption in it.

Habbak. ii. 3, 4, compared with the epistle to the Hebrews x. 37, 38.

In regard to this quotation also, we have shewn† that the Hebrew text has not been corrupted. The general meaning of the Hebrew, of the Septuagint, and of the Greek Testament in this place is the same.

In the following passages also, a different reading in the Hebrew has been suspected, but mostly without reason:—

* Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 460, et seq. † Ibid. p. 438.

Isaiah lxi. 1, 2.	Luke iv. 18, 19.
„ liii. 7, 8.	Acts viii. 32, 33.
Habb. i. 5.	„ xiii. 41.
Psalm x. 7.	Rom. iii. 14.
„ xix. 5.	„ x. 18.
Isaiah lix. 20, 21.	„ xi. 26, 27.
Deut. xxxii. 35.	„ xii. 19.
„ xxxii. 42.	„ xv. 10.
Isaiah lxiv. 3.	1 Cor. ii. 9.
„ xxviii. 16.	1 Peter ii. 6.

The following too which differ from the Hebrew but agree with the Septuagint, have sometimes been suspected of corruption in the Hebrew; or at least a few of them:—

Isaiah xxix. 13.	Matth. xv. 8, 9.
Amos v. 25-27.	Acts vii. 42, 43.
Isaiah lv. 3.	„ xiii. 34.
Prov. iii. 34.	James iv. 6.

A few others have been thought corrupt, as Matth. xxi. 5, compared with Zech. ix. 9 and Isaiah lxii. 11.

Here it has been thought that Matthew and the Septuagint read עני *meek*, instead of עני *afflicted*. But this is unnecessary, for the latter adjective also denotes *lowly*.

All the quotations in the New Testament have been fully given and minutely examined by the writer in another book, and therefore he will not dwell farther on them at present. There the fullest and most complete list has been given which exists any where, amounting to 255, drawn out in four parallel columns, exhibiting the Septuagint, the Greek Testament, the Hebrew, and the received version of the Hebrew, with copious annotations and remarks; no fewer than 182 octavo pages being occupied with the subject.*

* Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 334, et seq.

CHAPTER XXII.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE RABBINICAL WRITINGS.

AMONG the sources of various readings and the means of restoring the authentic text, are the Talmud and other writings of the learned Jews.

The oldest part or text of the Talmud, viz. the Mishna is generally supposed to have been written towards the close of the second century. It consists of six parts or divisions called *sedarim*, סדרים, each of which is subdivided into various tracts or treatises *massictoth*, which are again divided into chapters or *perakim*.

It might have been expected that many various readings should be found in this work, since it has so many quotations from or references to the Old Testament text. But there are very few in the printed editions. Frommann, who examined it for the purpose, found no more than the following, and yet he consulted three printed editions :—Isaiah x. 13, שׂוסתי; Numb. xxxii. 29, אליהם with *yod;* Numb. xxxii. 22, נקיים; Malachi iii. 23, הנכי for אנכי, הנה and אליהו for אליה; Psalm lxviii. 27, יהוה for אדני; Prov. xxii. 28, גבול עולים; Deut. xxiv. 19, בל תשוב; Job i. 1, וישר ירא, without the copulative; Joshua viii. 33, ושטריו; 2 Chron. xxviii. 15, הלבישום; Lev. xxv. 36, בל תקח ממנו for אל תקח מאתו; Ezek. xlvi. 21, ארבע מקצעות instead of ארבעת מקצועי.*

The poverty of this collection is surprising. But it ceases

* Frommanni Opuscula, p. 1-46.

to be so to those who know that editors of the Talmud have not rigidly and closely adhered to the MSS. of it, but have altered it after the Masorah. Each successive editor applied his hand in rendering the text more agreeable to the Masoretic one; so that the quotations from it are generally the same with the original. Thus in the Frankfort edition of the Mishna, Josh. viii. 33, and 2 Chron. xxviii. 15, agree with the Masoretic text; and in the edition of Menasseh Ben Israeel, Ezek. xlvi. 21 coincides with the same text. The older the printed edition of the Mishna is, the more departures has it from the present text.*

The Gemara or commentary on the Mishna made at Jerusalem, was compiled about 370 A.D.;† and the Babylonian Gemara was completed at a later period, about 500 A.D.

These also furnish various readings, and may be serviceable in correcting the text. The commentaries in question contain many more deviations from the present text. Both Talmuds, the Jerusalem and the Babylonian, were collated by Dr. John Gill for Kennicott's edition, and are given under No. 650. He found about 1000 various readings, most of them trifling. We know nothing of the way in which he proceeded, or the editions he used; but there is reason to believe that he increased the number by injudiciousness. He has given as various readings what are not really such. Hence his quotations exceed those of Frommann in the Mishna.

In collating the Talmud for a critical purpose, it is necessary to bear in mind that the Talmudists sometimes exhibit an allegorical play upon words in a passage, and turn it in many ways to suit their fanciful trifling. In these cases there is a liability of being led astray, and supposing that real variations of the Biblical text are meant. It is not difficult

* Eichhorn, Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 453.

† According to Moses Maimonides, Abarbanel, Simson Mikkenon, and Elias Levita. See Wolfii Biblioth. Hebr. vol. ii. p. 683.

however to discriminate between such allegorical plays and true variations; since the former are mostly preceded by the formula אל תקרא כן אלא תקרא כן, *do not read so, but so.* This formula however is not always a sure test; because it sometimes stands before actual variations. The collator must look to the connexion of the place in which such allegorical turnings appear; and to all other circumstances that discover the genius of various readings.

Again, the Talmudists sometimes quote loosely and from memory. Here no reliance can be placed on their citations. Or, they merely allude to expressions in the Old Testament, without formally adducing them. In other cases, they adduce just so many terms as are necessary for their purpose. Sometimes they refer to the passage they quote by adducing the first words only, leaving the reader to supply the remainder. And sometimes something is added to a cited passage for explanation. Hence every discrepancy from the Masoretic text is not at once to be considered a various reading. It may be so only *in appearance.* Yet generally speaking, the citations of the Talmud are exact and literal; and therefore they may be properly applied in criticism. They are older than the Masorah, and consequently much older than existing MSS. Their testimony is equivalent to that of MSS. of the same age, *i.e.*, of about the fourth century. Wherever such quotations agree with ancient versions against the Masoretic text, great value belongs to them. We might hope to derive from them important aid. But few comparatively are of importance. They relate to minor points of orthography and the like. Doubtless their number would have been greater and their internal character far different in value, had the editors of the Talmud followed their MSS. and not altered according to the Masorah. If therefore a greater number of good readings from this source be wanted, manuscript copies must be sought out and examined. It is true that they too may have been occasionally

altered; yet they must have undergone much less correction. But we have little hope that this work will ever yield many important readings to assist in restoring the original text; though it be explored with the greatest diligence.

The Masorah has been already described. It contains a number of critical observations which are useful in shewing the true reading. Most of our editions however are now conformed to the Masorah.

The פֵּירוּשִׁים or *commentaries* of the Rabbins which belong here, are those of Rabbi Salomon Ben Isaac or *Rashi*, as he is usually called by abbreviation, and sometimes *Jarchi*, who is of very great repute among the Jews as an interpreter of Scripture. But his style is obscure and difficult. He was a native of France, and belonged probably to the twelfth century. There are also the commentaries of Rabbi David Ben Joseph Ben Kimchi or *Radak*, a Spanish Jew belonging to the end of the twelfth century, who occupied himself chiefly with grammar; of Rabbi Moses Bar Nachman or *Ramban*, belonging also to Spain, but to the thirteenth century, whose commentaries are both cabbalistic and practical; of Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson or *Ralbag*, a Spaniard belonging to the fourteenth century, who was addicted to philosophical speculations, and has been accused of naturalism; of Rabbi Abraham Ben Meir *Abenezra*, a native of Toledo who lived in the twelfth century, highly esteemed by Jews and Christians for his literal mode of interpretation; of Rabbi *Saadias* Gaon, an Egyptian Jew belonging to the tenth century, who translated the Pentateuch into Arabic; and of Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon or *Rambam*, a very learned writer of the twelfth century, who though born in Spain, lived for the most part in Egypt. Among the numerous works written by Maimonides on many subjects, the chief is his פֵּירוּשׁ הַמִּשְׁנָה or *commentary on the Mishna*, written in Arabic and translated into Hebrew. Six prefaces prefixed to parts of this work were translated into Latin and published

with the original Arabic (in Hebrew characters), by Pococke under the title of *Bava Mosche, Porta Mosis* (Oxford, 1655, 4to). He also composed יָד חֲזָקָה, *Manus fortis, strong hand*, a sort of abridgment of the Talmud, consisting of four parts and fourteen books; each book containing a number of tracts or treatises.

His מוֹרֵה נְבוֹכִים, *Moreh Nebocim* or *Teacher of the perplexed*, explaining the reason of the Mosaic precepts, is perhaps best known.

Bruns* asserts, that David Kimchi adduces the variations of MSS. more than other Rabbins. The older Jews such as Rashi and Abenezra, adduce some; Maimonides the fewest. The various readings however which are found in all their writings, as far as their writings have been examined for the purpose, are neither numerous nor important. They lived and wrote at a time when the Hebrew text had been already fixed by the Masorah. Hence their citations agree with modern MSS., over which they have merely the advantage of age. As far as we yet know, this source is of little benefit to criticism.

But it has not been properly examined. Greater attention should be paid to it. Perhaps more advantage might arise from it than what is supposed. One thing should be done, viz. MSS. of Rabbinical writings, and not printed editions, should be employed in collation; because many alterations have been made after the printed Hebrew text. This is apparent from Kimchi's *Liber radicum*, in which the Hebrew text is often quoted differently from the printed one, as is seen from Latiph's edition published at Naples A.D. 1490. The editor carefully collected all the variations occurring in the work and placed them in an appendix, warning the reader against the supposition of their being typographical *errata*. But succeeding editors of the work quietly corrected the variations after

* In the Annal. Litterar. Helmstad. for 1782, p. 104.

printed editions of the Hebrew text; and omitted Latiph's most valuable appendix. Various readings out of Rabbinical writings are given by Tychsen* and Bruns. Some of them at least are mistakes of memory. Criticism need hardly expect much benefit from this source, however carefully explored.

The commentaries of other Rabbins, the books Zohar, Bahir, and Cosri, the various Rabboth, Midrashim, &c. are later, or less important, or very difficult to read, exhibiting little relative to the present subject. Even if they were minutely explored, which their intrinsic value scarcely justifies, they would furnish nothing at all proportionate to the time and labour expended.

General Observations on this Source.

The Talmud and other Rabbinical writings are not important as sources of various readings and of emendation. Few valuable quotations from the Old Testament are found in them.

The first thing is to consider, whether such authors really *mean to quote Scripture.* Not unfrequently they refer to it from memory, or in so cursory a way as gives no definite idea of the original words. Hence it is important to attend to their modes of quotation and reference. The *Mishna*, as far as it has been yet examined, contains no valuable readings. It is however the most ancient and best part of the Talmud; and readings found in it are of proportionably greater weight. The *Gemara* is later, and quotations in it may be regarded as of equal value with various readings derived from Origen and Jerome's works; whereas those taken from the Mishna are of the same authority with such as are found in Aquila, Symmachus, the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan, and the old Syriac version. Where the text is carefully ex-

* In his Buetzowischen Nebenstunden, and in the Repertorium für biblisch. und morgendl. Litteratur, Theil i.

plained in the Talmud; where a passage is repeated in the same words; and an appeal made to MS. copies, the work is an important witness in a critical view. In other respects, it must be employed with great caution.

The latter Rabbins are of less value in this respect. They did not often quote exactly. Where they take pains to explain a passage and refer to MSS., they should be attended to; but where they cite partially, loosely, and from memory, they are worthless. Those who have written commentaries on separate books of Scripture, especially literal commentaries, deserve to be consulted. They cite accurately the words of the original for the purpose of explaining them. Sometimes too they adduce various readings found in collated copies. From such commentators numerous varieties of reading may be extracted, especially from MS. copies of them. In their printed state, they have been corrected in many places after the Masoretic text. Abarbanel and Jarchi may be mentioned as among the best commentators of this class. Though Kimchi in his *Book of Roots* quotes many passages, he must have trusted largely to memory, because no such words as he gives are found in the Bible. On the whole, we do not expect that much critical benefit will be got from this source. Besides, the works of the commentators are too recent to exhibit a text older than the Masoretic. As they lived in the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the varieties of reading they furnish are equal in value to the readings of MSS. bearing the same age.

Philo quoted from the Septuagint, and therefore he scarcely belongs to our present purpose. Josephus too used the same version more than the original Hebrew. It is difficult, however, to get any real readings from this writer. He took great liberties in narrating things from the sacred books. It is not easy to say what he found in his copy, so inexact is he.

CHAPTER XXIII.

HEBREW MSS.

ANOTHER source from which a pure text is obtained is contained in Hebrew manuscripts. These are divided into two classes. The first consists of *synagogue rolls* or sacred copies; the second, of *private copies* made for common use.

1. The synagogue rolls contain the Pentateuch; the *Haphtaroth* or sections of the prophets appointed to be read; and the book of Esther. The three however are never put together, but form separate rolls. In consequence of the Mosaic books being reckoned the most important and sacred by the Jews, a synagogue roll is usually styled by them תּוֹרָה (*Torah*) or סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה (*Sepher torah*) *the Law*, or *Book of the law*. It is also called מְגִלָּה *a roll*, from its form.

As to *the material* of these rolls, Jewish superstition has defined it very minutely. The parchment must consist of the hides of clean animals, prepared by a Jew precisely for this purpose, and joined together with thongs of the same material. Every skin must have a certain number of columns, which columns are equal throughout the whole. The length and breadth of these columns is accurately determined. They are not to have fewer than forty or more than sixty lines.

The entire roll must be ruled with regular lines, and if more than three words are written without a line, the entire manuscript is rejected. Black ink alone of the purest kind

must be used; not red, green, or any other colour. A particular receipt is given for preparing the ink. Soot, charcoal, and honey are mixed up together into a sort of paste, and allowed to harden. Before being used this is dissolved in water, with an infusion of galls. The transcriber must follow an *authentic* manuscript, adhering to it so closely as to write nothing not even a *yod* from memory; but in every case looking first into the original before him.

The roll must be written with the square character, the seven consonants שעטכזבין being furnished with their *coronulae* or *apices* called *taggin*. In proper places are to be put *the extraordinary* points, and consonants of unusual figures. No vowels or accents are to be written, and no soph-pasuk at the end of verses. Words must not be divided at the end of lines; and the two poems Exod. xv. and Deut. xxxii. must be arranged in hemistichs, as the Talmud directs.

A certain space is directed to be left between each consonant, word, and *parshiah* or section. Between every *book* three lines must be left. And the fifth book of Moses must terminate exactly with a line; though the others may close in the middle of one.

Nor are these the only prescriptions to which the scribe must slavishly attend. He must sit in his full Jewish dress; and as often as he has to write the name of God must purify himself and wash the whole body. Besides, his pen must not be dipped into the ink immediately before writing the sacred name, but the ink is to be taken into it when transcribing the preceding word, so that the letter immediately going before should be marked with it. And such must be his devotion of mind and attention, that should a king address him when writing this name, he must take no notice of him till after its transcription.

The revision of the roll must be undertaken and completed within thirty days after it has been finished. Three mistakes

on one page or column are allowable; but four vitiate the whole. In like manner, if there be a mistake in the sections *open* or *closed*, or in the two songs already specified which are written as verse, the copy is rejected. Whether a mistake committed in transcribing the sacred name renders the roll unfit for synagogue use, is disputed among the Jews themselves. Should there chance to be a word with a deficient or redundant letter, or should one touch its neighbour, &c. &c. the entire manuscript is spoiled. After being pronounced fit for use in the synagogue, the two ends are properly fastened to two cylinders, that it may be conveniently rolled up and unrolled again.

Such is a specimen of the minute, irksome, and absurd regulations laid down by the Jews in respect to their synagogue rolls. The scribe who does not feel them to be an almost intolerable yoke, must possess uncommon patience. They are minutely laid down by the author of the *Massichta Sopherim* annexed to the Talmud, which was probably written in the sixth century. They must therefore have been observed in the preceding century, or perhaps two centuries before. But there is no doubt that they were subsequently enlarged, as is evident from Maimonides.* Out of these sources Shickhard reduced them to order.† Such superstitious regulations have been productive alike of advantage and disadvantage. The Mosaic books have been preserved to us by this means in a more accurate state than other parts of the Old Testament. None dared to alter the words in the least particular; or to tamper with the text in the smallest point. They have been kept remarkably free from error. Yet it cannot be denied that disadvantages have arisen. The text has been kept too much conformed to the one unvarying type, and that not the original one, as may be inferred with probability. For many of the

* Halich. Teph.

† Jus Regium Hebraeorum, ed. Carpzov, Lipsiae, 1674, 4to.

rules, perhaps most of them, are of an origin too late to maintain the true archetypal text approaching very nearly to the autographs. The Masoretic text has been stereotyped in a measure by these rules. Hence criticism gets comparatively few valuable readings from them; except in cases where the copyist and reviser have been somewhat careless in attending to the established prescriptions.*

Few synagogue rolls fall into the hands of Christians. When no longer fit for use they are buried in the earth, in a place called *Gheniza;* or put away where profane hands are not likely to come in contact with them.

2. *Private* or *common* manuscripts are either written in the square character like that of the rolls; or in the Rabbinical. Let us attend to those of the former sort.

Such private MSS. as have the square character are in folio, quarto, octavo, duodecimo. Even at the time when the Talmud was written, these different sizes existed.† Their material is parchment, cotton paper, or paper of an inferior quality. On the former sort of paper is cod. 33 of Kennicott; on the latter 11, 25, 35, &c.

The consonants are commonly written with black ink prepared much in the same way as that used in the synagogue rolls; but for the vowel points and the smaller marginal writing another kind of ink is used. A finer pen is also employed for the latter. In consequence of the large, thick form given to the consonants, and the very black ink used in writing them, they continue distinct and clear for a long time; while the slender and fine forms of the vowels added to the ink used in writing them, fade much more quickly. Their colour becomes reddish by degrees, and vanishes so as to render them undistinguishable. Yet there are exceptions to this rule; for the consonants and vowels are occasionally alike

* See Eichhorn's Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 456, et seq.

† Bava Bathra, fol. 13, c. 2, &c.

black. In certain cases, the ink of the latter exceeds that of the former in blackness.

In many of them the initial letters and words are adorned with gold and variegated colours. One manuscript at Leyden containing the Psalter is known to have the vowels and accents written in red ink.*

The pages are carefully prepared and divided, so that everything on them may have just proportions. Columns, lines, consonants, outer and inner, upper and lower margins occupy due space, and are regulated with a view to mutual adaptation. The number of the columns on each page of folio and quarto manuscripts depends on the breadth of the copy itself and the opinion of the transcriber. No page however exhibits more than four. The same number is not always retained throughout. Poetical portions and books usually written in hemistichs, and consequently in small lines, occasion alterations in the number of columns. These columns contain either the Hebrew text alone, or more commonly with a version. Sometimes the text is put twice in two adjacent columns, first in its pointed, then in its unpointed state, as in cod. 325 of Kennicott. The Chaldee paraphrase is the version generally affixed, which occupies either a peculiar column of itself; or is inserted between the text, so that the text and version follow each other like two successive verses. In cases where the latter could not be written verse by verse after the Hebrew text, as in poetry where hemistichs are employed, ex. gr. in Exod. xv. and Deut. xxxii. it is in the outer margin in smaller letters. And where lists of proper names occur or Chaldee portions, the Hebrew text is written twice with great exactness. The Chaldee version like the text is furnished with vowels and accents. Occasionally the transcriber spared himself the labour of accentuation; putting merely a *silluk* at the end of every verse.

* See Wolfii Bibliotheca Hebraea, vol. iv. pp. 93, 94.

Some MSS. have an Arabic version written in the manner of the Chaldee one. Others have the Hebrew text, the Chaldee and Arabic translations written after each other in each successive verse. Others have the Vulgate in a column adjacent to the original text. Rarely is a Persian version found, as in cod. 324 of Kennicott.

The length of the lines is indefinite, and consequently the number of consonants in each. The breadth of the MS. and the arrangement of columns must determine the lines. The number of lines in each page also varies according to the size of the MS. itself.

As to *the character* of the letters it is what is called *the square* or Chaldee. All MSS. present it except the few written in what is called the *Rabbinical.* This character varies very little. With the exception of a few inconsiderable little curves, elongations, abridgments, and ornaments it is the same. It has undergone no material change in the progress of centuries. The middle ages have affected it very slightly. It is therefore sufficiently correct to affirm that the Hebrew consonants exhibit one character, viz. the square, in all synagogue rolls and the great majority of private MSS. Some distinctions however have been made in it, of which we shall speak hereafter.

The initial consonants of books or sections have been made larger in many copies, and ornamented in various ways with pictures, trees, flowers, and animals. Sometimes they are surrounded with part of the Masorah. Hence they were not always written by the scribe at first, especially as a particular pen was kept for them; but an empty space was left for their insertion. In consequence of occasional accidents they are either wanting altogether, or exist only in faint outline. Other MSS. have the initial letters of the same size as the rest, without illumination or painting of any kind.

In regard to the vowel points in MSS. it may be useful to mark the following peculiarities:—

Kametz is not put into the body of *caph final* but under it, either below or by the side of the long stroke.

Chirek often stands under a movable yod, as in שַׁדַּי.

Cholem does not very often coincide with the diacritic point of *Shin*, but appears thus מֹשֶׁה, מֹשֶׁה, מֹשֶׁה.

In the name יְהוָה, *Cholem* is seldom put over *vaw*.

Kametz is very frequently furnished with *Sh'wa* (ְ), that it may be the more easily distinguished from *Kametz long*.

Sh'wa is generally put *under caph* final, not in the body of it. Other consonants, besides *caph*, are often furnished with *sh'wa* at the end of a word; *vaw* most frequently. Thus we find עָלָיְו and עָלָיו.*

Compound *sh'wa* is separated, *sh'wa* being put into *the body of the consonant* to which it belongs, and the vowel *under* the consonant; and *vice versa*. Thus we have אַחֲרֵי or אַחֲרֵי.

With regard to the *diacritic points and accents*, *Mappik* is not put *into* ה, but for the most part under it (הִ).

Sh'wa often occupies the place of *patach furtive* רָקִיעַ.

Raphe which is seldom used in printed editions, is very common in MSS.

A kind of *Dagesh* also is used which is neither *lene* nor *forte*. The figures of the *accents* deviate in many ways from those used in printed Bibles.†

The *extraordinary points* (puncta extraordinaria) which appear over some words even in our printed Bibles, were taken from MSS. In the latter however they have not always the form of simple points, but also of little circles, and of perpendicular strokes.

The *Piska* or empty space found in printed editions is variously marked in MSS. Sometimes a marginal annotation is given and not the empty space; sometimes *piska* is denoted by the omission of a whole line or half a line; sometimes by a marginal annotation besides.

* Schiede, Observ. Sacr. biga, § xix. p. 88, et seq.

† Ibid, § xxi. p. 93, et seq.

Abbreviations are seldom introduced into the text; for the most part in words well known; or in such as are repeated in the vicinity. The mark of abbreviation is a little stroke after the last consonant, as ישר׳ for ישראל.

Rarely is the sacred name יהוה abbreviated *in the text;* though Kennicott says that cod. 36 has it twice ״. In *the margin* it is abbreviated in various ways.

Jewish transcribers never divide a word between two lines; nor do they ever write beyond the point at which the line terminates. But they do not leave an empty space at the end of the line, lest the beauty of the writing should be marred. In order to fill it, they abbreviate words as well as single consonants, or put so called *custodes linearum*, *line-keepers.*

If the empty space were *considerable*, they resorted to various expedients. They wrote in it as many letters of the word following as it would contain, and then put the entire word in the new line. It is sufficiently indicated that they were supernumerary letters by the fact that the vowels were not affixed to them. Sometimes, in addition to this mark, they put only half of the last consonant, as הע for השמים; at other times they completed the imperfect word with a peculiar figure resembling more or less nearly one of the letters. Again, they put into the space in question all sorts of favourite consonants.

If the empty space were *inconsiderable*, it was filled up either with the first letter of the following word, or with another favourite letter, or a small line, or with a figure like the capital Greek *tau.* Sometimes the deficient letters were put in smaller form over the line, on the margin.

Other expedients still were resorted to besides these, such as placing before the word which was insufficient to fill out the line one or two little points; at the end of a verse repeating *soph-pasuk* two or three times, or putting a little stroke resembling *vaw* or *yod.*

Every line also began at the very point intended for it. If

it did not so through some oversight, the little empty space was filled out with a stroke or a figure.

The spaces between the lines were kept as clean and free from marks of any kind as possible, for the sake of the calligraphy. Yet this did not prevent the insertion of corrections between them. The most usual of these smaller emendations consist of the *matres lectionis* in words written defectively. We have also seen, that over the line, at its termination, were written in smaller characters letters for which there was not room in the line itself. A few MSS. have a Latin version between the lines, which must have been added by a Christian.

With respect to the space between single books, the Jewish rule was, that at the end of every book written by Moses five lines; of every greater prophet four; of every minor prophet three lines, should be left. But the precept was not strictly observed. The space left between books is not always empty. The number of verses in the book is stated; or small sentences are given. In regard to these separate books, MSS. do not agree with printed editions; for the two books of Samuel read as one, without any division between them. The books of the Chronicles are also one. So too Ezra and Nehemiah. Daniel Bomberg separated them in his edition of the Bible, agreeably to the Vulgate.

The *Parshioth* and *Haphtaroth* are carefully separated. Thus the initial word is often written with large consonants and vowels, a space being left before it. In this empty space are written פפפ or פ; or ססס and ס provided it be a close section; indicating the commencement of the *parshiah*. These letters are occasionally ornamented. The commencement of the smaller sections is indicated by a small open space. In a few MSS. the distinctions of *Parshioth* and *Haphtaroth* are not made.

The upper and lower margins which are occupied by the greater and lesser Masorah, contain more or fewer lines accord-

ing to the nature of the Masorah itself. The usual number is three lines in the upper and three in the lower; though of course there are many exceptions. This Masorah is formed into various figures, of animals, &c. Jewish prayers, psalms, sections from the law are occasionally found in the same place; which are also shaped into curious figures. Sometimes the commentary of a Rabbin occupies the upper and lower margins. In rarer cases, the titles of the *parshioth* are given in the upper margin; and words of ominous import appended beneath the column which closes in a melancholy mood.

The outer margin of MSS. is filled with various matters. Ordinarily corrections of the text are placed there, omitted words supplied, and words incorrectly written rectified. It is also used for Rabbinical commentaries; for palaeographical, critical, and exegetical scholia; for noting the *Haphtaroth* and *Parshioth;* for indicating in the case of Haphtaroth and Parshioth which section out of the law is to be associated with a particular section out of the prophets on the Sabbath, and *vice versa;* for pointing out the middle of books; for collections of various readings; and for all sorts of figures, which are made up of various materials. And when the upper and lower margins do not contain all the text intended for them, what is left is given on the external margin. Hence the latter occasionally exhibits fragments of the great Masorah, Rabbinical comments, &c.

The inner margin between the columns has the *K'ris* and lesser Masorah. But sometimes the revisers of MSS. put their corrections into it.

In regard to the arrangement of the books it was twofold, one prescribed by the Talmud, the other by the Masoretes. According to the Talmudic order, the Pentateuch was followed by Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, the twelve minor prophets, Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther,

Ezra, Chronicles. The Masoretic order puts Isaiah before Jeremiah and Ezekiel. German MSS. follow the Talmudic; Spanish, the Masoretic arrangement. In German MSS. the Hagiographa stand thus:—Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Chronicles. But in Spanish MSS. they appear thus:—Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Solomon's Song, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra. Many MSS. depart from both arrangements. In like manner the order of *Haphtaroth* is different among the German and Spanish Jews.

In almost every MS. there are certain subscriptions different in position and kind.

Subscriptions at the end of *single books*, give the number of verses contained in it; and sometimes the name of the transcriber, with an edifying Rabbinical proverb.

Subscriptions at the end of *the whole MS.* give the name of the scribe; sometimes the names of the punctuator and Masorah-writer besides; the year of the world; occasionally the name of the person for whom the copy was written; to which were subsequently appended the names of the possessors into whose hands it came. Such subscriptions are valuable parts of the MS., because by their means critics may be helped in determining its age, country, and quality. It is to be regretted however, that comparatively few copies have such subscriptions. Doubtless they were commonly affixed at first; but various causes have contributed to their disappearance. The MSS. to which they belonged were separated into various parts, some of which were scattered and lost. Nor is it always easy to find the subscription belonging to a MS. It may be concealed among the Masorah; or in some isolated place; or twisted into a figure. There is considerable difficulty in making a proper use of these subscriptions because of their peculiarities and ambiguities. Thus there may be a mistake in the number of the year; or uncertainty may arise from the

omission of the era whence the year is dated, as in 332 of Kennicott.* Sometimes hundreds are left out; again, thousands. Where the mere name of the copyist is given, unless he be a very celebrated person, the name is of no use. Sometimes consonants stand for unusual numbers. Sometimes the number is concealed so artificially, that it can be arrived at only by a lucky guess. It is also certain that the possessor of a MS. when he wished to sell it, occasionally altered its age to enhance the value. He gave it another subscription, or altered the old one, or erased, or retouched. This is exemplified in cod. 611 of Kennicott.† In certain cases also, we find MSS. represented in their subscriptions as *younger* than they really are. If every Jew, according to the Talmudic regulation, was bound either to write a MS. himself, or get one written, he was tempted to alter the subscription of one which he may have inherited from his ancestors, to make it appear that he had either written it himself, or caused it to be made at his own expense.

Most MSS. have passed through several hands, such as the writer of the consonants or *sopher*, the punctuator or *nakdan*, the reviser, the Masorah-writer, the scholiast, the freshener or retoucher. All these were seldom employed on one and the same manuscript. Some had to do with one copy, others with another.

Occasionally the scribe or *sopher* after writing the consonants appended the vowels and Masorah. Beauty and correctness were the chief things at which he aimed in writing the consonants. The vowels and accents were not put till after the letters had all been written. The latter work was finished before the former commenced; each having a peculiar ink and pen for itself. Various particulars leave no doubt of the fact that the *sopher* and punctuator were generally different

* See Schnurrer's Dissertationes Philologico-criticae, § 7, p. 15, et seq.

† Ibid, § 4, p. 7, et seq.

persons, and that they followed exemplars which did not always agree with one another in their readings.

Most of these scribes were Jews, as is shewn by the subscriptions, and by the peculiar figure of the consonants in those which have no subscriptions. Whether some of them were Christians has been disputed. Tychsen argued* that many MSS. proceeded from the hands of Christian scribes; but Eichhorn examined and refuted most of his arguments.† It is certainly incorrect to affirm, that all MSS. which have the Masorah painted in the margin with the figures of dragons, sphinxes, lions, bears, &c., were not written by Jews but by monks; for Rabbi Jacob Ben Chayim and Elias Levita looked on them as the work of Jews.‡ Christian monks would have used *crosses* and other such figures. It is likely that proselytes wrote some of the MSS. which have been supposed to betray the hand of a Christian. Perhaps those written from left to right, such as 28, 71, 73, 77 of Kennicott, proceeded directly from Christian copyists. Bruns conjectures§ that No. 649, and Eichhorn admits that 392 of Kennicott, appear to be of the same origin.

The vowels and accents proceeded from the same person. Some MSS. have a subscription from his own hand, giving his name. When the scribe was not the punctuator too, if the subscription do not give the names of both, we must judge of their diversity by the want of agreement between the vowels and consonants. Generally speaking, all words reckoned right by the punctuator were furnished by him with vowels. But it must not be inferred of necessity that because occasional words and even lines are left without such appendages, they were condemned in his judgment. Where words were

* Tentamen de variis Codd. Hebr. generibus, p. 9, et seq.

† Eichhorn, Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 529, et seq.

‡ Schnurrer, Dissertationes, &c. pp. 26, 27.

§ Dissertatio Generalis, p. 527.

well known, or the same lines had already occurred in the immediate vicinity, it was deemed unnecessary to furnish them again with their appropriate vowels. In several instances the vowel pointing stops in the middle of the MS.—a circumstance which may have arisen from various causes. Where passages of the same MS. exhibit two or more modes of pointing together, it may be inferred that a reviser compared it in whole or in part with another MS.

The *K'ris* in the margin were usually written by the punctuator. In this way he corrected the text.

In many cases he also prevented mistakes in the letters of the text, where they were apt to be mistaken. Thus in letters of the same shape, by adding or leaving out a *dagesh lene*, or by the use of *Raphe*, he clearly shewed what he took the consonant to be.

The *reviser* coincided with the scribe when the latter wrote not only the consonants in the text but also the vowels. But the punctuator acted generally as the chief corrector of the copy. When he left words without vowels, substituting for them in the margin other words with smaller consonants and the vowels; when a word twice written appeared once without vowels; when he erased the consonants in any way, or altered them by some condemnatory mark with which the vowels agree; in such cases he who put the vowels acted as the corrector of the MS. It is evident however that many MSS. have passed through the hands of a corrector different from the punctuator. This is deducible from the fact of the vowels disagreeing with the emendation attempted in the consonants; from a twofold pointing in the same word; from a difference between the consonants in the margin in respect to tracing and ink as compared with the ink and tracings of the punctuator in the *K'ri* on the margin.

Occasionally the writer of the Masorah corrected the text in order to make it conformable to his Masorah.

These remarks shew that many MSS. have passed through the hands of various revisers. And the number of such persons may be determined by a minute examination of the text, if they have not expressly subscribed their names.

Care was taken not to lessen the beauty of the copy, and so impair its value by leaving the corrections or making them apparent. Hence everything was not altered which was seen to be incorrect. The marks of correction were also drawn into beautifying strokes; or so minutely and delicately made that the elegance of the copy was not lessened.

As to the *Masorah-writer*, it is obvious from the preceding remarks that he is often identical with the scribe and punctuator; or where these do not coincide, with the latter alone. But when, as in other cases, the Masorah proceeded from a separate person, it is difficult to ascertain the fact. If he gives his name as distinct from the others, the thing is obvious; or if he occasionally finds fault in his marginal annotations with the scribe and punctuator because they did not adhere more closely to his Masorah, the individuality is clear. There are other ways in which it may be discovered that the Masorah-writer was a different person from the other two, as Schiede has pointed out in his description of the Cassel MS.* It is unnecessary to allude again to the fantastic and artificial forms which his remarks were made to assume externally.

A *scholiast* or *critic* has been distinguished from the reviser or corrector; critical remarks on the margin of copies leading to the existence of a person who did not revise in silence but ostensibly and openly, because he finds fault with the scribe and punctuator. The name of the scholiast is seldom given; and when given, it is concealed in isolated places, monograms, and in other words.

Besides such critical remarks on the margin, there are

* See Observationum Sacrarum biga, p. 42, et seq.

sometimes scholia and glosses of a grammatical and exegetical kind, proceeding from a particular individual who had nothing else to do with the entire copy. Indeed the scribe himself occasionally put scholia in the margin, notifying mistakes which he had made in copying, and which he had observed before the MS. was finished.

The *freshener* or *retoucher* was he who went over anew with ink passages which had become faded or illegible from various causes. Unfortunately, many an old reading has been lost through this process. *

We have said that the square character appears in all Hebrew MSS. with the exception of those written in Rabbinic. The Jews however speak of a twofold kind of writing in the square character itself, the *Tam* and the *Velshe* character.

The Tam character is distinguished by sharp pointed corners, and finely drawn *coronulae* or *taggin* on the consonants which take them. The author is supposed to have been *Tam* the grandson of Rashi, in the twelfth century. It is usual in the synagogue rolls, especially those belonging to German and Polish Jews. An approach to this character is made by the Hebrew letters which appear in the editions of the Bible that issued from the press of Froben at Basel.

The *Velshe* character, according to the Jews, is of greater antiquity than the *Tam*. It is said to be usual among the Spanish and Oriental Jews, in their synagogue rolls and other copies. The writing is rounder than the other; and the *coronae* of the consonants end in a thick point.

The *character* of the MSS. has been also distinguished into Spanish, German, and Italian.

The Spanish is perfectly square, simple, and elegant. The types employed in the Hebrew Bibles of Robert Stephens and Christopher Plantin approach to it.

* See Eichhorn's Einleit. vol. ii. p. 467-551.

The German is rude, crooked, and sharp pointed, like the types in the Basel editions of Munster's Bible.

The Italian character is intermediate, being rounder than the German, but not so square or well formed as the Spanish.

Sometimes the character is of a mixed nature, the same letters having somewhat various shapes in different places, so that the prevailing type is uncertain. The Spanish character also in the most ancient MSS. is less elegant, and approaches near what is termed the *Italian.* Thus the lines between the three are not always distinctly marked.

The *country* of MSS. has been determined in various ways. Thus *the character* just mentioned has been supposed to indicate it. The Spanish Jews made use of the *Velshe* character, it is said. But as the character cannot always be ascertained, especially in the case of *the most ancient* Spanish MSS. which are so like Italian ones in this respect, it is not a safe mark of country. Besides, Germans and Italians may have imitated the more beautiful Spanish character, to enhance the value of their manuscripts.

In Spanish MSS. the initial letters are commonly of the same size with the rest. But this does not always hold good.

It is also alleged, that the Spanish MSS. are written with simplicity, without ornament, flourish, or any little superfluous curve. But surely German calligraphers may have copied MSS. in the same manner.

Nor can Spanish copies be determined merely by the order of *Haphtaroth;* because copyists in no country adhered to any *one* order of them.

Another mark of country, which is by no means a safe criterion, is, that Spanish copies have the Targum at the side of the text and in smaller character; not along with the text itself or single verses.

The Spanish Jews are also said to have followed the Maso-

retic order of the books. But we know that no one order is followed by any class of MSS. They depart both from the Masoretic and Talmudic arrangement.

It is also supposed that the Spanish copies follow the Masoretic text more closely than others, because the writers were more critically inclined than the German Jews. Hence it is said that they revised them, compared the text with other copies, and put critical remarks in the margin. One thing is certain that Spanish MSS. are most esteemed by the Jews, being pronounced more accurate and better than all others. The most ancient of them however depart from the Masorah in many instances. Other modes of distinguishing these MSS. are still more ambiguous. Thus Michaelis asserts, that the vowel point ה̇ is used in them not only for *Chatuph Kametz*, but for *Kametz Chatuph*, a thing which occurs in very many other copies.

Certain readings are also said to characterise Spanish MSS. such as in Exod. xv. 31, תיעשה, written without the yod תעשה by the Spanish; and in Numb. xxiii. 2, דכה is said to be the Spanish reading, while others have דכא. But the Spanish copies do not adhere to these readings.

Again, Spanish MSS. are said to exhibit the hemistichs in Exod. xv. in a peculiar manner. But all transcribers have not been alike in this respect; and German copyists may have imitated the peculiarities of Spanish MSS. which fell into their hands.

We are also informed, that Spanish MSS. contain *Oriental* readings, but German *occidental* ones. But whoever compares MSS. throughout will soon find that Oriental and occidental readings are mixed together in them all.

Nor can it be inferred with truth that Spanish MSS. furnish all words with vowel points, those for example in Levit. vii. 18-38, while the German copies leave them unpointed. This were to make the Germans uniformly desirous to save

themselves the trouble of writing the vowels, and the Spanish uniformly industrious and painstaking. Industry does not depend on country.

On the whole, the criteria for determining Spanish MSS. are uncertain. Where there is a clear subscription indicating the country, the matter is clear; but where there is no such evidence, other internal phenomena are indefinite.*

With regard to German MSS. they are said to be written in the *Tam* character; with the German order of *Haphtaroth;* in an artificial way with figures of various sorts, and little ornamental hooks on the consonants—the initial letters being usually larger than the rest and ornamented; with the Talmudic order of the books; and with the western readings, so that in this respect they agree more with the Samaritan and the ancient versions, and differ from the Masoretic. They have also the Chaldee paraphrase in alternate verses; while the *matres lectionis* and the *full* letters are more frequent. Still the possibility, not to say probability, of a German copyist procuring a Spanish MS. and following it very closely suggests itself to the mind of the critic.

The considerations lying against the certainty of these criteria will be obvious from the remarks made on Spanish MSS. None of them affords a good or safe index of country.

But though none of the *criteria* alleged can of itself determine the country to which MSS. belong, probability can be reached by the coincidence of the majority of them. When we find all or most of such marks uniting in the case of a single copy, it becomes highly probable that it belongs either to Spain or Germany. The presumption becomes stronger in proportion to the number of the single circumstances which unite in any given MS. Hence the rules in question are not useless or valueless. Little worth as they are apart, their united force deserves attention. Far from being useless, they may be pro-

* Eichhorn, Einleit. vol. ii. p. 551, et seq.

perly employed in determining the country of MSS. provided they are not unduly pressed, or made to give a testimony apart which cannot safely be elicited from them. In this respect Kennicott and De Rossi have not been very judicious. Much as they had to do with Hebrew MSS., it may be questioned whether their rules for judging of them are in many cases the best or safest. But the field was comparatively new; and they ought not to be hastily censured. They could not do all things equally well.

In determining Italian MSS. there is little else to rely on than the character itself towards a knowledge of their country. Sometimes the manuscript itself specifies the country where it was written. But in most, subscriptions of this kind are wanting.

Bruns has been more successful in his determination of the country of MSS.; and we should be more disposed to rely on his method of ascertaining it. The marks which he employs for the purpose are the following: Spanish MSS. are written with paler ink than German ones. In them the pages are seldom divided into three compartments. The Psalms are written like the thirty-second chapter of Deuteronomy, as it is in most editions of the Bible. The Chaldee text does not alternate with the Hebrew in single verses, but occupies a peculiar position at the side of the Hebrew text, in smaller character. In like manner the Spanish scribes arrange the Hagiographa after the Masoretic rule, and never put Jeremiah before Isaiah. The lines always end with an entire word; to effect which the letters are sometimes put more closely together, and sometimes farther apart. Sometimes an empty space is left between the closing words of a line, or it is filled with particular signs. Sometimes the last letters of the closing words run beyond the line. The half of a book is not marked in the text itself; still less with the usual letters. The initial words of the *parshioth* are not larger, and not set apart from

the rest. Figures, ornaments, and little decorative flourishes are wanting in Spanish MSS. The beginning of *parshioth* is signified in the margin פרש with small letters. A threefold פ at the beginning of a *parshiah* is not found in the text. Every book does not end with a חזק. Books are separated by a space of four lines. *Metheg* and *Mappik* seldom appear; but *Raphe* or a peculiar stroke over the *undageshed* consonant is frequent. These criteria along with the Spanish character will determine, in Bruns's opinion, a Spanish copy.*

The age of MSS. is difficult to be determined. There are no palaeographical and critical marks, such as lead scholars to infer the age of MSS. belonging to the Greek Testament with tolerable certainty. The most direct and certain way of discovering it is by the subscriptions. Even they however do not always afford clear indications, because they did not in all cases proceed from the hand of the first copyist, or because there are mistakes in the number of years, or the era is left out, or the name of the copyist is unknown.

It is to be regretted that so few MSS. have subscriptions. In their absence various particulars have been supposed to point to age. Here however Hebrew palaeography is indefinite. Conjecture must be chiefly employed. When that conjecture is directed and guided by an extensive acquaintance with MSS. it need not in general be far astray. A comparison of such copies as can be assigned with certainty to their proper period with those whose age is indeterminate, and long familiarity with their characteristics, will be of much service.

Formerly the age was derived from such marks as these: The elegance and simplicity of the written character. When it was free from little hooks, twisted ornaments, pictures, and such artificial appendages, it was thought to be of considerable

* See Praefat. ad Kennicott, Dissert. Gen. pp. 11, 12, and the Neues theologisch. Journal of Ammon, Haenlein, and Paulus, vol. vi. pp. 755, 756. See also Eichhorn, Einleit. vol. ii. pp. 555-557.

antiquity. A MS. was also judged to be old, if it had little or no Masorah; if it wanted emendations and critical interpolations; if the vowel points were absent; if the letters were obliterated in many places and written over again; if there was but a sparing use of letters with unusual forms such as larger and smaller ones; if the Mosaic books were written continuously without spaces between each section; if יהוה were generally used for אדני; if the Talmudic order of the books were followed; if the poetical books were divided into hemistichs; if the parchment were yellow, thick, and coarse; if the ink of the consonants were black and that of the vowels pale and faded. But it has been shewn by Tychsen, Schnurrer, and Eichhorn, that such marks are doubtful. The text itself of a particular MS. must always and chiefly be consulted for this purpose. If it contain frequent characteristic departures from the Masoretic text which agree with the ancient versions except the Targums, there is a strong presumption that the text of it is ancient. When to this are added the most reliable of the preceding marks, viz. no vowel points and no punctuation throughout, because when the vowel system was generally introduced it was not common to write unpointed copies in the square character; retouched words and letters with the ink pale, and that of the consonants paler than the vowels—the probability of antiquity in a MS. is greatly increased. No one consideration should be depended on by itself. The greater the number of such criteria as have been mentioned, though they are singly of no value in determining the antiquity of MSS., the more likely is the copy in which they meet to be an ancient one. But in every case, it is a most difficult thing to fix on the particular century or part of a century in which an ancient MS. wanting a subscription should be placed.

When we speak of a Hebrew MS. being *ancient*, it should not be younger than the thirteenth century. Those belonging to

the twelfth century have a fair claim to the epithet; but such as are older than that are very ancient, and so far most valuable. Yet there are exceedingly few which can be put earlier than the twelfth century.

The goodness of a MS. depends on its *antiquity*, it being a natural conclusion that the older it is, the nearer it approaches the text of the original. But this very natural inference is discountenanced *by fact* in so many cases, that the rule ceases to be of much use. It may happen that a MS. 600 years old may be transcribed from one of 700, while a MS. of 500 may be transcribed from one of 800, or from a copy which had better readings. In determining therefore the goodness of a MS., it is necessary to judge it by its own text, according to the acknowledged rules of criticism. Its readings must be examined fairly and impartially, and its value be fixed accordingly. Apart from that course, there is no other safe way of arriving at a general estimate of its merits. It is true that rules have been proposed for determining the goodness of a MS., but like those relating to age, they are fallacious. Thus it has been affirmed that Spanish copies are the best. Next to them are the French and Italian; the German being the worst of all. It is certainly true, that the Spanish character is the most beautiful. The calligraphy of Spanish copies is unquestionably the finest. They are elegantly written. And the Rabbins have always praised them, giving them a decided preference over all others. But it is easy to see how a copyist studious of elegance and neatness, would be less disposed to correct mistakes, lest the appearance of his MS. should be marred. All that can be said with truth is, that Spanish copyists have bestowed greater pains on their MSS. than others, so that on the whole, *the class* is more accurate. Yet there are exceptions. Hence every copy must be judged apart by its own text. Again, it has been said that the goodness of a MS. may be inferred from the learning of its copyist. Pro-

ceeding from a learned transcriber, it is more valuable than if it came from the hand of an ignorant one. But this is a very uncertain mark; for a learned man is more prone to deviate from the original. An ignorant transcriber will generally adhere the most scrupulously to the copy before him; while another may forsake it. It has also been thought that a copy made for the use of the synagogue, or that of a Rabbin, is likely to be good. But this criterion is also doubtful. Again, if a MS. has been *accurately lined*, it is highly valued. This belongs to calligraphy rather than to the text itself on which all the value depends.

With regard to the *classification* of MSS., they have been variously divided.

They have been distributed into (1.) synagogue rolls, of which but a small part is in the hands of Christians; and (2.) private MSS. in folio, quarto, octavo, which were never used in the synagogue. The latter again have been divided into *Masoretic* and *unmasoretic*, pointed and unpointed, corrected and uncorrected, mixed and pure, oriental and occidental, *cabbalistic* or *midrashitic*.

None of these classifications is pertinent or useful, because founded on intangible, insecure premises. And yet it is necessary for the criticism of the Old Testament to have a good classification of MSS. founded on the internal state of their texts. If there be, as is probable, a similarity of characteristic readings among them, there should be *recensions* of the text. But it is certain that there cannot be such recensions or families as are made in the MSS. of the New Testament, unless a very different class of copies from any now existing be discovered. Taking *recension* in the sense it bears in the criticism of the Greek Testament, there is but one recension of Hebrew MSS.; for by far the greatest part of them are of European origin, and consequently belong to the recension of Aaron Ben Asher which was spread over the countries of Europe.

The division into Masoretic and unmasoretic is perhaps the most approved one. Yet it is of small value. There are no copies which agree in all respects with the Masorah. The Jews have not been able to produce a single copy exactly conformable to the Masorah. And on the other hand, the unmasoretic copies embrace all existing ones, if by the epithet be meant such as do not everywhere coincide with the Masorah. The deviations from it are greater or less in them all.

As to corrected and pointed, uncorrected and unpointed MSS. they are one and the same.

Pure MSS. are such as have the Hebrew text in Hebrew letters; *mixed*, those which have the text written in Arabic, Syriac, Greek, Latin, Samaritan characters. The objection to this division is, that there are scarcely any Hebrew MSS. which are not in the Hebrew character.

As to Cabbalistic MSS. we know of none. The term is used by Tychsen.

Oriental MSS. comprehend such as were written in Egypt and the East; *occidental* such as were produced in Spain, France, Italy, and Germany. Among the older Jews, Babylonian MSS. were sometimes called Eastern, in contradistinction to Palestinian which were termed Western.

3. MSS. written in the Rabbinical character.

The so called *Rabbinical* is a sort of cursive character, and differs somewhat in different copies. Sometimes it is the complete Rabbinical character; in other copies it approaches to it. Rabbinical MSS. are written on paper, and are all comparatively modern. Most of them have no vowel points or Masorah. They have many abbreviations of words; and various consonants can hardly be distinguished from one another. Sometimes they are accompanied with an Arabic version. Critics assign little value to these Rabbinical copies.

CHAPTER XXIV.

DESCRIPTION OF SEVERAL HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS.

We shall now select a few of the oldest and best Hebrew MSS. that have been collated, for the purpose of giving a brief description of them.

1. Cod. 634. De Rossi, in quarto.

   This is but the fragment of a MS. containing Levit. xxi. 19—Numb. i. 50. It is on parchment, without the vowel points, Masorah, and K'ris. It has also no interval between the *parshioth* or sections. Sometimes however there are points between the words. It is the opinion of De Rossi that it belongs to the eighth century. It was taken from the Gheniza—or place in which the Jews bury their synagogue rolls lest they should fall into profane hands—at Lucca, and is corroded by age. The character is intermediate, approaching the German. It belonged to the private library of De Rossi.

2. Cod. 503. De Rossi, in quarto.

   This is a manuscript of the Pentateuch on parchment, and is made up of different pieces. It begins with Gen. xiii. 14 and ends with Deut. xv. 12. There is a chasm in it from Levit. xxi. 19—Numb. i. 50, because De Rossi separated this portion, thinking it to be older than the rest, and characterised it as an independent fragment by the preceding number (634). The vowel points are attached to it, but not throughout; and they were evi-

dently put by the same hand as that which wrote the consonants. There are no traces of the Masorah or K'ris. Sometimes there is a remarkable agreement between its readings and those of the Samaritan text and ancient versions. De Rossi places the various pieces of which it is made up in the ninth and tenth centuries. It was found in the same Gheniza with the preceding.

3. Cod. 590. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript contains the Prophets and Hagiographa, and is on parchment. The text has the vowel points, but apparently from a later hand. The margin does not exhibit the Masorah, but variations are noted here and there. Some books have the final Masorah. But the separate books have no titles, and they are arranged in the oldest order, Jeremiah and Ezekiel coming before Isaiah, and Ruth before the Psalms. According to the date in the subscription, it was written A.D. 1019, or 1018 by another reckoning. Hence it belongs to the beginning of the eleventh century. The MS. is preserved in the Imperial library at Vienna.

4. Cod. 1. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, and is preserved in the Bodleian library at Oxford. It contains the entire Old Testament beginning with Gen. xxvii. 31. At first it was furnished with the final Masorah; but the letters are greatly faded and in many places they have been renewed. The manuscript differs very remarkably from the Masoretic text, and agrees with ancient versions. Kennicott assigns it to the eleventh, but De Rossi to the twelfth century.

5. Pentat. Hebraicus convolutus.

A rolled manuscript of the Pentateuch formerly in the Duke of Sussex's library. Mr. Pettigrew thinks* that

* Bibliotheca Sussexiana, vol. i. part 1, p. 5.

it is the most ancient and most perfect MS. of the Pentateuch in England. It is written on 79 brown African skins, and measures 23 inches in breadth, 144 feet in length. There are 263 columns, each of which contains 42 lines. The square character of it is very ancient, and the ink with which it is written is beautifully black. There are no capital letters, no accents or vowel points. There are also no marginal corrections, but there have been erasures and alterations. The text is said to be very correct. It was brought from Senna in Arabia to Amsterdam, and thence into this country. As far as we know, no person has collated it.

6. Cod. 536. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the Pentateuch, the Haphtaroth or prophetic sections, and the five Megilloth. It begins with Gen. ii. 13, is without the Masorah, and has at the commencement and end several leaves of a later date. Here and there on the margin variations are marked. According to De Rossi it is of great value, and belongs to the end of the eleventh century, with which opinion Kennicott agrees. Deposited in the Malatestian library at Caesena.

7. Cod. 162. Kennicott, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, but defective till Joshua vi. 20; from 1 Sam. i. 1—1, 10, and from 2 Sam. xxiv. 10 to the end. In many places the letters have been renewed, and some words have been changed in the process of renewing. It belongs to the eleventh century, and is now in the Medicean library at Florence.

8. Cod. 262. De Rossi, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing the Pentateuch, Megilloth, and Haphtaroth. It has the vowel points which appear to have been written by the copyist.

The Masorah and K'ris are wanting. Its readings often agree with the Samaritan text and ancient versions. According to De Rossi it belongs to the eleventh century. It was in his private library.

9. Pentat. Hebraicus convolutus Chethamiensis.

This is a rolled MS. of the Hebrew Pentateuch in the library of Chetham College, Manchester. It is written on 45 brown African skins, and measures in length 106 feet, in breadth 20 inches. There are 204 columns, each column having 48 lines. The breadth of each column is about four inches. The letters, which are of the modern square character, are black and well preserved, and the text without points, accents, or marginal annotations. There are some few erasures and corrections; and some parts of the MS. are blackened but not illegible. The largest erasure and correction is at Exod. xxxviii. 24, where three lines are blotted. The usual seven letters have the coronulae (or *Taggin*), and there are the great and small ones in common with other copies. The last word in Deuteronomy is wanting. No person has collated it, nor is anything known of its history. The donor's name was Byron. It is of comparatively late date.

10. Cod. 10. De Rossi, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing the Pentateuch and Megilloth, without Masorah and K'ris. It begins with Gen. xix. 35, the preceding portion being absent. It has the Targum. De Rossi places it in the end of the eleventh century or the beginning of the twelfth. It was in his private library.

11. Cod. 349. De Rossi, in quarto.

This manuscript is also of parchment, containing the book of Job. It wants the Masorah, and has but one K'ri added by the person who put the vowel points. De Rossi

assigns it to the end of the eleventh or the commencement of the twelfth century. It was in his private library.

12. Cod. 379. De Rossi, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the Hagiographa. At the beginning and end it is defective, for it commences with Psalm xlix. 15 and ends with Nehem. xi. 4. It wants the Masorah and K'ris. The poetical books are arranged in hemistichs. It is one of the most important Hebrew MSS., and is of the same date as the preceding, or somewhat earlier. It belonged to De Rossi.

13. Cod. 611. De Rossi, in octavo.

This manuscript is also of parchment, containing the Pentateuch, without the Masorah, and with a few K'ris. The writing is much faded. It is defective till Gen. i. 27. De Rossi assigns to it the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century.

14. Cod. 4. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains all the Old Testament. It is defective like many others, for it does not begin till Gen. xxxiv. 21, and terminates with 2 Chron. ix. 5. Jeremiah and Ezekiel precede Isaiah according to the most ancient arrangement. It belongs to the twelfth century and is of special value. The Bodleian library possesses it.

15. Cod. 154. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing the prophets with the Targum written between the lines. It is defective from Joshua x. 12-32 and 1 Sam. xii. 21—xvii. 1. No manuscript has as many variations from the Masoretic text as this one. The subscription, which proceeded from the copyist himself, states that it was written in the year of the world 4866 that is, A.D. 1106.

Both Kennicott and De Rossi value it highly. Formerly it belonged to Reuchlin; but it is now in the public library at Carlsruhe.

16. Cod. 193. Kennicott, in octavo.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing the Pentateuch, without the Masorah and the vowel points. The first chapters of Genesis, the last of Levitieus, and the part of Deuteronomy from v. 26, proceed from a later hand. At the end we find from the hand that wrote the termination of Deuteronomy a subscription stating that it was written in the year of the world 5047, *i.e.* A.D. 1287. This must be regarded only as the date of the supplied part. The remainder belongs to the twelfth century. It has many erasures and alterations, yet it contains many remarkable deviations from the Masoretic text. It is evident that the author of the MS. was a Christian, because words are divided at the end of lines, because dagesh forte is expressed by the doubling of the letter, and also because the name Jehovah is written with three *vaus*. It is now in the Ambrosian library at Milan.

17. Cod. 201. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing the Prophets and Hagiographa. It is defective in many parts, till 1 Sam. xx. 24; from Ezek. xi. 19 till Isaiah xli. 17; from Esther ix. 16 till Ezra ii. 69; from Ezra viii. 24 till Nehem. i. 5; and from 2 Chron. xix. 6 till the end. After the second book of Samuel the remaining portions are arranged in a very unusual order. Thus Jeremiah follows Samuel, then the books of Kings, then Ezekiel and Isaiah. After Esther follow Ezra and Nehemiah. The margin has extremely few Masoretic annotations. According to Kennicott it belongs to the beginning of

the twelfth century. It is now in the Ebnerian library at Nürnberg.

18. Cod. 210. Kennicott, in quarto.

This parchment manuscript contains the whole of the Old Testament. It wants the Masorah, and has but a few K'ris. It is rich in good readings. Both Houbigant and Starck speak in praise of it. It belongs to the twelfth century. The royal library at Paris possesses it.

19. Cod. 224. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the Prophets and Hagiographa. But it is defective in various parts, viz. till Joshua vi. 16; from Ruth i. 1 till ii. 4; from 2 Chron. xiv. 10 till xix. 8; and from 2 Chron. xxxiv. 22 till the end. The books are arranged in the most ancient order, Ruth preceding the Psalms, Jeremiah and Ezekiel preceding Isaiah. The three poetical books are arranged in hemistichs. This manuscript has many readings agreeing with the ancient versions. It is assigned to the beginning of the twelfth century, and is now in the royal library at Königsberg.

20. Cod. 366. Kennicott, in quarto.

This parchment manuscript contains the prophets. It is mutilated however from Jerem. xxix. 19 till xxxviii. 2; and from Hosea iv. 4 till Amos vi. 12. Isaiah follows Ezekiel; and the MS. belongs undoubtedly to the better class. It was written at the beginning of the twelfth century, and is now in the St. Germain library at Paris.

21. Cod. 216. Kennicott, in octavo.

This manuscript is on parchment, containing the Psalms and Proverbs. It is without the Masorah. The Psalms are written in hemistichs. Starck assigns it to the tenth century. But it is thought by Kennicott and De

Rossi that the Proverbs procceded from a later hand; and they agree in attributing them to the fourteenth century, while they place the Psalms in the twelfth. The MS. is in the Sorbonne library at Paris.

22. Cod. 293. Kennicott, in folio.

This parchment manuscript contains the Pentateuch and the Megilloth. The text is much effaced owing to its antiquity. It is apparent, however, that it was written with great care. In the most remarkable readings it coincides with the Samaritan text and ancient versions. The book of Esther from vii. 6 has been supplied by a recent hand. According to the subscription, the MS. was written in the year A.D. 1144. It belongs to a private library at Toledo.

23. Cod. 531. Kennicott, in folio.

This parchment manuscript contains the Prophets and Hagiographa. It belongs to the year A.D. 1193, and is in the library of St. Saviour's at Bologna.

24. Cod. 326. Kennicott, in quarto.

This very elegantly written parchment manuscript contains the Hagiographa, Joshua, Judges, and Samuel. It is mutilated however from 2 Sam. xi. 25. Job is wanting from xxi. 10 till xxvii. 19. According to the subscription it was written A.D. 1198, and is now in the royal library at Paris.

25. Cod. 461. Kennicott, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the Prophets. It is defective from Joshua viii. 3, and from Isaiah xl. 26 till xlii. 13. It is the only codex having that remarkable reading which agrees with the apostle's quotation in Habak. ii. 4. It is assigned to the close of the twelfth century, and is now at Rome in the Vatican.

26. Cod. 527. Kennicott.

This manuscript contains the Pentateuch in a roll. It is written without vowel points. Kennicott and Bruns assign it to the close of the eleventh century; De Rossi to the thirteenth, with less probability. It is preserved with great care in the Dominican cloister at Bologna, and was said to be the autograph of Ezra.

27. Cod. 528. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing the Pentateuch and Hagiographa, with the Masorah. It is defective from Deut. xxix. 3 till Psalm xxxiii., and belongs to the end of the twelfth century. It is preserved at Bologna.

28. Cod. 56. De Rossi, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains Job and the Proverbs. It is defective till Job xxix. 15; from xxxi. 13 till xlii. 3; and from Prov. xxix. 25 till the end. The text is arranged in parallel strophes; but the writing is greatly faded. It belongs to the twelfth century, and was in De Rossi's private library.

29. Cod. 248. De Rossi, in folio.

This parchment manuscript contains the Pentateuch with the interlinear Targum, the Megilloth, and Haphtaroth. It is defective till Genesis vii. 13; and the Haphtaroth reach to the eighth day of the Passover. There is no trace of the Masorah or K'ris. De Rossi places it in the twelfth century. It belonged to his private library.

30. Cod. 537. Kennicott, in folio.

This parchment manuscript contains the books of Kings, and belongs to the twelfth century. It is now at Bologna.

31. Cod. 350. De Rossi, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing the Psalter.

The first page has been supplied by a later hand; and according to the subscription, the same person affixed the vowel points and Masorah. Considerable value belongs to the MS. which is dated by De Rossi in the twelfth century. It was in his own library.

32. Cod. 552. De Rossi, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the Proverbs, Job, and Chronicles. It is defective however at the beginning and end, for Prov. i. 1—ii. 1, and 2 Chron. xix. to the end, are wanting. It has no Masorah, few K'ris. It belongs to the twelfth century, and is justly esteemed by De Rossi of considerable value. It was in his private library.

33. Cod. 555. De Rossi, in duodecimo.

This parchment manuscript contains Leviticus and Numbers, with the interlinear Targum and Haphtaroth. It is defective till Lev. vi. 10, and has no traces of the Masorah, few of K'ris. The last three leaves have been supplied by a later hand. In remarkable readings, the text agrees with the Samaritan and Septuagint. The date is the twelfth century. It belonged to De Rossi.

34. Cod. 614. De Rossi, in quarto.

This parchment manuscript contains the Megilloth. It has also the Haphtaroth. It is defective at the end, and belongs to the twelfth century. It was in De Rossi's private library.

35. Cod. 645. De Rossi, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the Psalms. But it is defective till Psalm iii. 9; and the last leaf has been added by a later hand. The readings of it are valuable. De Rossi assigns it to the twelfth or thirteenth century. It belonged to himself.

36. Cod. 416. Kennicott, 649 De Rossi, in quarto.

This parchment manuscript contains the Pentateuch

with the interlinear Targum. It wants the Masorah, and has few K'ris. It is also mutilated till Exod. xxx. 3, and from Deut. xxxii. The readings are valuable. The date is the twelfth century. It belonged to De Rossi.

37. Cod. 580. Kennicott, 701 De Rossi, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the former Prophets. But it is mutilated till Joshua ii. 5. It wants the Masorah, and has few K'ris. Both Kennicott and De Rossi assign it to the twelfth century. It belonged to the latter.

38. Cod. 634. Kennicott.

This is a synagogue roll of the Pentateuch, but defective from Levit. xxii. 5 till Numb. xxxi. 50. It has been assigned to the end of the twelfth century, and is at Helmstadt.

39. Cod. 704. De Rossi, in folio.

This parchment fragment contains part of the second book of Kings from chapter xxiii. 24 to xxv. 13, with the Targum; and belongs to the latter half of the twelfth century. It was in De Rossi's private library.

40. Cod. 602. Kennicott, in quarto.

This manuscript is of parchment, containing all the Old Testament. But it is defective in various places, viz. from 2 Sam. xii. 27, to the end of the book; from Jerem. xliv. 26 to Ezek. viii. 3; and from Isaiah vii. 24 to xxxiv. 1. Jeremiah and Ezekiel precede Isaiah; Job is before Proverbs, and Ruth before Canticles. It belongs to the close of the twelfth century, and is at Erfurt.

41. Cod. 775. De Rossi, in quarto.

This parchment manuscript contains the books of Chronicles and the Psalms, and wants the Masorah. It be-

longs to the twelfth century, and was in De Rossi's private library.

42. Cod. 107. Kennicott, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the Pentateuch, Megilloth, and Haphtaroth. It is defective, however till Exod. vi. 23; and from Zech. xiv. 16. The 67th Haphtarah is wanting. Kennicott assigns it to the middle of the thirteenth century. It is in the British Museum.

43. Cod. 33. De Rossi, in folio.

This manuscript is of parchment, and contains the Hagiographa, with the Masorah. It has been written out with great care, in the year of our era 1290, according to the subscription. It belonged to De Rossi.

44. Cod. 109. Kennicott, in quarto.

This parchment manuscript contains the Pentateuch, Haphtaroth, and Megilloth. Between Lamentations and Esther it also has Jerem. viii. 13—ix. 23. The part till Gen. i. 27, has been written by a later hand. It has many good readings, and is assigned by Kennicott to the thirteenth century. It is in the British Museum.

45. Cod. 226. De Rossi, in folio.

This parchment manuscript contains the Prophets former and later. It is defective however, like most others, till Joshua i. 15. The Masorah and K'ris are wanting. Jeremiah stands at the head of the prophets. De Rossi, who thinks it of great value, places it at the close of the twelfth century. It belonged to himself.

46. Marked No. 1 by Pinner.

This is a Pentateuch roll on leather, containing the five books of Moses complete. Of course it has no vowels, accents, or Masorah. The roll consists of forty-five pieces, every piece an ell in height, making in all fifty-

six ells long. The writing in the last book is not so fine as that of the preceding four. As to the form of the letters, it is considerably different from the present one. This is particularly observable in the case of נמלזנא. The rules of the Masorah are complied with in the writing, so that the roll resembles those now in use. Dr. Pinner, who states that he read it throughout, observed but a few variations of no consequence, which he gives. The subscription states that the MS. was corrected in the year 580, and therefore it must have been written earlier, consequently the roll must be older than 1271 years. Pinner expresses no doubt of the correctness of the subscription, though the words of the MS. are separated from one another, whereas such separation did not take place till 800-1000 A.D. In all MSS. earlier than that date, the words stand closely together. The roll was brought from Derbend in Daghestan, and is now at Odessa. If the subscription be genuine, it is the most ancient MS. known to exist.*

47. No. 5. Pinner.

This is a roll of the Pentateuch, but an incomplete one. The writing begins with Numb. xiii. 19. The form of the letters is very different from the present. The scribe was a Caraite Jew, and was very careless in copying the work. Hence it has many mistakes; words and letters being frequently omitted. According to the subscription, it was written in 843. It is at Odessa.

48. No. 11. Pinner.

This is a fragment belonging to a synagogue roll, and beginning with Deut. xxxi. 1. The inscription assigns it to the year 881. It is at Odessa.

* See Prospectus der der Odessaer Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Altherthümer Gehoerenden aeltesten hebräischen und rabbinischen Manuscripte, pp. 5-7.

49. No. 3. Pinner, in small folio.

This MS. contains Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, and is on good parchment. Every page is written in two columns, between which, as well as below, and in the outer margin, the Masorah stands. Of the *great Masorah* from two to three lines stand below. Every column contains twenty-one lines. After each verse there are two points, to which, without any interval, succeeds a new verse. But this is not observed where a new topic commences, for there a small vacant space or a new line appears. The vowels and accents are wholly different from those now in use, not merely in form but in position, since they are all *above* the letters. The first page has a twofold pointing, viz. above and below; but this does not occur again except occasionally in verses or words. From Zech. xiv. 6 to Malachi i. 13, there is no punctuation; and the first three verses of Malachi alone have been pointed much later, in the manner at present used. The entire codex is very correctly written; and where a mistake was made the scribe himself has for the most part corrected it. Hence great value should be attached to its variations from the present text. As to the letters, their form is very considerably different from the present.

This unique MS. has been collated throughout by Pinner; and it will be seen that the various readings are numerous. They are very important.

The MS., according to the inscription which belongs to the year 956, was written 40 years previously, *i.e.* 916 A.D. It is at Odessa. Pinner has observed, that the examination of this MS. may have an important bearing on various questions, such as the Hebrew vocalisation, the accents, the Masorah. It is certainly unlike any other, the differences suggesting grave questions of

much interest to Hebrew scholars. Stern published a small treatise about it, in which he promised another and fuller work. Ewald and Luzzatto have written about its vowels and accents. An excellent fac-simile, for which we are indebted to Dr. Pinner, gives an accurate idea of the writing, letters, and accents.

50. No. 13. Pinner, in folio.

This is an incomplete MS., consisting of 115 leaves on good parchment, containing 2 Samuel from vi. 10 to the end; and the two books of Kings. Each page has three columns, between which, as also at the sides of the text, stands the Masorah, in two lines above, and in three, four, and five below. The vowels and accents are written; but they are different in many respects from those now in use. The text has many and important various readings. The Masorah is of peculiar interest, and deserves to be examined. Some of the letters are very large and beautiful, not unlike in form to those of the last mentioned MS. Pinner thinks that they belong to the same time and country, though the vowels and accents of this one differ from the other. Two points stand after each verse; and 2 Kings succeeds 1 Kings without a vacant space between. An inscription states that the MS. *was purchased* in 938. It is obviously a most important codex. Pinner has given some of its readings. Like all the rest examined by the same scholar, it is now at Odessa.

51. —. Pinner, in small folio.

This MS. contains the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa, on good parchment. Each page has three columns, except in Psalms, Job, and Proverbs, where there are but two. The text is furnished with vowels and accents; and two points stand after every verse. The letters and accents are similar to those in No. 3 of

Pinner. The little Masorah stands between the columns, and on the external and internal margins. Only from two to four lines of the great Masorah are found above and below. Being a Caraite MS., it has not been written with accuracy. Hence words and verses are sometimes written twice. It is highly ornamented with gold and silver colours, and is minutely described by Pinner. The MS. itself states that it was written in Egypt in the year 1010. At present it is at Odessa.

52. No. 4. Pinner, in quarto.

This MS. contains the Pentateuch, beginning however with Gen. xxvii. 25, the rest having been lost; the five Megilloth; after which is Exod. xvii. 8-16; Deut. xxv. 17-19; a Haphtarah, consisting of 1 Sam. xv. 1-10, 32, 33, and some other verses. Four leaves have been lost out of the middle. Each page is written in two columns, between which, as well as in the margins, stands the Masorah. Above there is one line, and below, mostly two. Each verse is followed by two points, after which the next is written, without an intervening space, except where a new subject begins. Six of the letters are like those in cod. No. 3. But the vowels and accents are like those at present in use. The subscription states that the MS. was written in 1140. It was collated by Pinner, and is now at Odessa.

53. No. 9. Pinner, in large folio.

This is a fragment consisting of six large leaves of good parchment, containing from Deut. xxxi. 23 to the end of the book. The MS. is much faded, and almost illegible. The text is written in three columns, with the Masorah between and on every side; and the great Masorah above and below. From the similarity of the letters to those in No. 13 of Pinner, it is inferred that they were written by the same person. The inscription

states that it was finished in 1132. Pinner however thinks this date to be spurious; and assigns it from internal evidence to the same date as 13, *i.e.* the end of the ninth or beginning of the tenth century. It is at Odessa.

Though the Samaritans make use of rolls in their synagogue, there is no copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch in Europe which is known to be of that form. All are in folio, quarto, duodecimo, or 24mo. The text is plainly written, without any ornament or decoration of the letters. The consonants also are not larger or smaller, inverted or suspended, like the Hebrew.

There are no vowel points, accents, or diacritic signs, such as belong to modern MSS. written in the square character. They have however certain diacritic signs and marks of division peculiar to themselves. Thus every word is separated by a point from the next one. There are also larger and smaller portions formed by two points thus (:). Occasionally a little star supplies their place. A line over the consonants of a word determines the sense of ambiguous expressions, shewing either that the word stands there in an unusual form, or that it is to be taken passively, or that some other peculiarity belongs to it, as in Exod. v. 3, בדבר; where the line shews that it should be read as בְּדֶבֶר *with the plague*, not בְּדָבָר, *with the word.* There are also various other marks, lines, and points, whose use cannot be well ascertained.* Morin conjectured that they often denoted certain affections of the mind.† It should be observed however, that such interpunctions and diacritic signs are not found everywhere and in all MSS. in the same form; but that they depended largely on the caprice of transcribers.

All the Samaritan MSS. which are known are written with black ink, except the Milan copy in the Ambrosian

* See Adler, biblisch-kritische Reisen, p. 144.

† Exercitationes in utrumque Samarit. Pentateuch, p. 90.

library, which has red ink. The material used is vellum or eastern paper. In defective MSS. the deficiencies are sometimes supplied on leaves of paper, the original MS. being vellum.

The margin of these MSS. has no scholia, Masoretic annotations, or corrections. It is quite vacant.

The Pentateuch is divided by the Samaritans into sections or קצין, *Katzin.* These sections however are much shorter than the *Parshioth* of the Jewish Pentateuch. Thus the MS. belonging to the Oratoire library in Paris, whence the Samaritan Pentateuch was first published by Morin, divides Genesis into 250, and all the five books into 966, *Katzin.* The mark of the commencement of a new section varies. Sometimes ·= or —< ∵ stands between sections; sometimes they are distinguished merely by an empty space. In the latter case, if the preceding section terminates in the middle of a line, the rest of the line remains empty; but if it terminates with a line, the whole of the next line remains unoccupied.

Unlike Jewish MSS., these of the Samaritans seem to have proceeded from one person, viz. the scribe. The corrector and the copyist were the same. Corrections too are not made in the margin, but in the text itself. But in the Barberinian Triglott, the variations of the Samaritan *version* are given in the margin.*

The subscriptions are of various kinds, and consequently of different degrees of value. Some copies give the number of the sections or *Katzin;* others relate to the history of the MS., mentioning sometimes the name of the transcriber, sometimes the year in which he wrote, the name of the possessor or purchaser, &c. &c.†

As to the age of these MSS. it is best determined by means of their subscriptions. But where such notices are wanting, or where they do not give the era and number of years, there

* Eichhorn, Einleitung, vol. ii. pp. 593, 594. † Ibid, p. 594.

is great difficulty in fixing the age by internal evidence. The subscriptions themselves cannot always be relied on.

The oldest known is generally supposed to be that numbered 334 by Kennicott, and assigned by him to the tenth century. But this age is probably too high. None that has a date in the subscription goes beyond the thirteenth century. One (333) was written at Damascus, A.D. 1559. Hence all the Samaritan MSS. are recent.

The accuracy with which they are written is not great. In this respect they are inferior to the Hebrew copies. The Samaritan scribes made many mistakes by confounding letters alike in form, by transposition, by neglect of orthography, to which belong arbitrary changes of gutturals. Examples have been given by Gesenius in his treatise on the Samaritan Pentateuch.*

Sixteen MSS. in the libraries of Europe were collated and described by Kennicott and De Rossi. To these must be added a seventeenth, which was unknown to them, viz. one in the library at Gotha, containing only a part of Genesis. Five are in Paris, seven in England, two in Rome, one at Milan, one at Leyden, and one at Gotha.

No. 334. (Kennicott and De Rossi) in quarto.

This MS. is on parchment. It is defective till Gen. xviii. 2; from Levit. xiv. 39 to xvii. 4; and from Deut. vii. 5 till the end. Morin calls it *the most ancient of all.* It may belong to the twelfth or end of the eleventh century. It is in the royal library at Paris (Peiresc. 2).

No. 363.

This is a beautifully written and perfect MS. on skin. It was purchased from the Samaritans in 1616 by a Valle; and is now in the library of the Oratoire at Paris. Though it has no date, yet it belongs probably

* Pp. 17, 18.

to the end of the eleventh century. Morin printed the Samaritan Pentateuch for the first time from it.

No. 197, in 12mo.

This MS. is on very thin parchment, and the characters are red. A good part of it is illegible, and many places are wanting. It is however of very considerable antiquity and value. It belongs to the Ambrosian library at Milan, and was collated for Bruns by Branca the librarian, who says it is not younger than the tenth century. It belongs probably to the twelfth.

No. 127, in quarto.

This excellent MS. on vellum is complete and transcribed all by one hand. A leaf of fine paper is put between every two leaves of the vellum. It is now in the British Museum (Claud. B. 8)—having belonged to Sir Robert Cotton, who got it from Ussher. It was collated by Ussher, who communicated the various readings to Comber. The latter sent them to Morin at Paris. The MS. was written A.D. 1362.

No. 62, in large quarto.

This MS. which has an Arabic version in parallel columns, but in the Samaritan character, is very imperfect. According to Kennicott, who assigns a high value to it, it was written near the middle of the thirteenth century. According to the subscription given entire by Bruns,* part of it was written or supplied A.D. 1524. It is now in the Bodleian library, having belonged to Ussher. It is on vellum and paper.

* Ad Kennicotti Generalis Dissertatio, p. 361.

CHAPTER XXV.

HEBREW MSS. IN CHINA AND OTHER ORIENTAL PARTS.

VARIOUS critics were long desirous to get information respecting the MSS. used by the Jews in China, as it was known that Jews had resided there for many centuries. They supposed that their copies must be very ancient, and uncorrected by the Masorah.

But the expectations entertained were dissipated by the information given by some Jesuit Missionaries, who made inquiries and published the result of them in 1774. Additional particulars were furnished by Koegler in the Journal of de Murr. These have been the only sources of European acquaintance with the Jews in China and their sacred books, till the present time; for Brotier in his first edition of Tacitus, drew from the Jesuit missionaries; and Michaelis did not profess to do more than digest and condense the information already existing.

It would appear then, that the Chinese Jews have rolls of the law, and copies taken from these rolls, with a supplement in two parts.

1. As to the rolls of the law, they lie in the innermost or most holy part of the synagogue, thirteen copies on thirteen tables. The oldest of them represents the authentic exemplar of Moses; the others, those of the twelve tribes. All are unpointed.

They were said at the time to be about 600 years old. At that period there was a great fire which consumed the synagogue rolls, and the Jews purchased one from a Mohammedan which he had got from a Jew at Canton; whence all the existing copies were derived.

2. In addition to these, they have copies of the law for private use. These are divided into fifty-three little books, *i. e.* sections, corresponding to the *parshioth* of the Palestinian Jews, except that the latter have fifty-four. The initial words serve for titles. Of the other books of the Old Testament, some parts are said to have escaped the fire 600 years before; and others to have been lost in the inundation caused by the Hoangho in 1446. All remains of them are put in two parts, as a supplement to the Pentateuch.

The first part of the supplement contains Joshua and Judges, both incomplete; the books of Samuel complete; the books of Kings with some defects; the Psalms.

The second part contains the *Haphtaroth* in about thirty little books. Formerly they had eighty such; but from the two causes already mentioned they lost fifty. To these are appended the books of Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Esther, but in an imperfect state. Isaiah and Jeremiah, they have in a tolerably complete form. Of Ezekiel they have nothing; of Daniel only a few verses of the first chapter; of Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, some passages; and nothing of the other prophets. They want Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song.

These MSS. have our present vowel points and accents. In like manner they have *Raphe.* The *puncta extraordinaria* are over one word at least, viz. וישקהו in Genesis xxxiii. 4; and in Genesis ii. 4 there is a small ה in the word בהבראם. No trace of a K'ri was found. The shape of the consonants is like that contained in European MSS. That of the accents is different.

There can be little doubt that these MSS. are Masoretic ones, and comparatively modern. The Chinese Jews carried on intercourse and traffic with Europeans; and the original of their MSS. must have been got from Europe.

The preceding account, it should be observed, relates to the Jews at K'ae-fung-foo, the only Jewish settlement known to be in China.

In December 1850 the Jewish synagogue at K'ae-fung-foo was again visited by two Chinese Christians in the employment of the London Missionary Society at Shanghae. The synagogue was found to be tottering in ruins. Not a single individual could read the Hebrew books. The few Jewish families who remained, sunk in the lowest poverty and destitution, had been without a Rabbi for fifty years. The messengers brought back eight MSS. containing portions of the Old Testament Scriptures. These MSS. are written on thick paper, bound in silk, and bear internal marks, as is supposed, of foreign origin, probably Persian. The portions of the Old Testament contained in these MSS. are Exod. i. 6, Exod. xxxviii.-xl.; Levit. xix. xx.; Numb. xiii.-xv.; Deut. xi.-xvi.; and Deut. xxxiii. Various portions of the Pentateuch, Psalms, and Hagiographa, which appear to be parts of an ancient Hebrew liturgy, are contained in two of the MSS.*

Fac-similes of these Hebrew MSS. were afterwards published at Shanghae†, from which it appears that the text is the Masoretic one, furnished with vowel points and accents. We have collated portions with the received text, and observed no variations.

* See a little work entitled, The Jews at K'ae-fung-foo: being a narrative of a mission of inquiry to the Jewish Synagogue on behalf of the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews: with an introduction by the Right Rev. G. Smith, D.D. Lord Bishop of Victoria, Shanghae 1851. Introduction, p. 10.

† Fac-similes of the Hebrew MSS. obtained at the Jewish Synagogue in K'ae-fung-foo. Shanghae 1851, 4to.

More valuable and interesting than these MSS. were twelve (sic) synagogue rolls, each thirty feet in length by two or three in breadth, which were in the holy of holies, but were not sold to the messengers. Measures were taken for procuring the latter also,* and two of them, in addition to the eight, are now in London, the property of the Jewish Society.

By the kindness of the Rev. Mr. Coleman of Ventnor, who has collated one of the rolls, I am enabled to state, that it is on goat-skins, not on sheep-skins. The writing is beautiful but somewhat peculiar, without points, accents, or large or small letters, and without any division into books, chapters, or verses. Where the divisions marked ס and פ occur in our present text, there is a small break or hiatus. Where פפפ occurs in Van Der Hooght, there is generally a blank space equivalent to that of *one line.* The age of the roll is not known. There is no clue to its antiquity. Each column consists of forty-nine lines; each line terminates with a perfect word; and each column with a perfect sentence. To effect this, some of the letters are dilated in a very extraordinary manner. The letters are smaller than those in the fac-similes of the other MSS., more regular, and more elegant.

As to the text itself, though several errors of transcription occur, and some variations affecting the orthography, there are none that can be considered deviations from the sense of the Masoretic text.

In the year 1806 Dr. Buchanan brought from the East a synagogue roll which he found among the Jews of Malabar. This copy of the Pentateuch, deposited in the public library of the University at Cambridge, was minutely described and collated by Mr. Yeates.† The roll is made of goat skins dyed red, and was discovered in the record chest of a synagogue of

* See Narrative. Introduction, p. 10.

† See Collation of an Indian copy of the Hebrew Pentateuch, &c. by Thomas Yeates, Cambridge 1812, 4to.

the black Jews. It is about forty-eight feet long and twenty-two inches broad. It is not however complete; for Leviticus and the greater part of Deuteronomy are wanting.

Notwithstanding the opinion of Bishop Marsh as to the value of this codex, there can be little doubt that it is an European Masoretic roll. The errors too which the scribe has fallen into, shew that he was careless. It may have been made in Spain, as the characters appear to indicate; or to have been copied directly from a Spanish MS. It is of little value, as Lee has properly judged.*

Observations on MSS. generally, and their Application to Criticism.

We have seen that all known MSS. belong, with a few exceptions, to one family. They are all posterior to the Masoretic revision. Hence not many various readings are derivable from this source; nor is much help afforded by it in restoring the true text in places where it has suffered. The *textus receptus* is the fruit of Masoretic labour—the representative of the MSS. which learned Jews revised for centuries. There are indeed some few MSS. whose writers occasionally preferred readings found in more ancient codices still extant in their day, to the Masoretic. Great value belongs to *their* readings.

All modern *editions* have been made conformable to the Masoretic text. All the more recent ones very closely agree, with the exception of some typographical errors. But in the ancient editions belonging to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there are *real* various readings. Hence these are justly reckoned equivalent to MSS. of the same age.

Most of the various readings collected by Kennicott and De Rossi from MSS. are of small value. Some are errors of

* Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia Minora, p. 23.

transcribers. Others relate to the quiescent letters, or the *matres lectionis*. If therefore the readings worthy of a critic's attention be alone regarded, a large mass will be discarded at once as worthless. They are diversities in *orthography*, rather than various readings.

The most obvious rule, if it can be called so is, that the reading found in the greater number of MSS. should be preferred. This however can only be *caeteris paribus*.

Besides *number*, the *character* of the MS. or MSS. containing a reading should be carefully considered. Thus the age ought not to be overlooked. Antiquity possesses some weight. The nearer MSS. are to the age of the writers themselves, the more value belongs to them. But the most ancient are comparatively recent. Yet as some readings which have been improperly perhaps rejected by the Masoretes may occur in these ancient copies, they deserve attention.

A recent MS. accurately written may be transcribed from a very ancient and a very accurate one long ago lost. In such case, antiquity is rather apparent than real, and may readily mislead.

The habits of the scribe should also be noted. Was he exact and scrupulous in his copying; or was he negligent in his work? Did he write for a synagogue or a private person? What sort of exemplar did the scribe follow? Can this be inferred from any known circumstances?

Again, to what country does a codex belong? The Spanish are esteemed by the Jews the most correct and the best, especially those made for synagogue use. Doubtless there are exceptions to the universality of this rule.

It is considered a mark of innate excellence in a MS. that it is not only accurately written, but contains besides many good readings differing from the received text, and clearly confirmed by the authority of ancient versions. This canon should not be applied absolutely, or pushed too far. It cer-

tainly needs limitation as applied by Cappell, Kennicott, and De Rossi. It should only be followed to a certain extent, and with great circumspection, lest ancient versions have an undue weight assigned to them.

On this subject as elsewhere rules are of little use. A few examples will be of more service to the young critic.

In Levit. ix. 21, the reading is, *as Moses commanded;* but in thirty-three MSS. and in various other documents the word יְהוָה is inserted, so that the clause reads, *as the Lord commanded Moses.* Here not only in consequence of the majority of codices, but their antiquity and value, the received reading must be retained as the true one.

2 Chron. x. 16. In this passage, the received text has רָאוּ, "when all Israel *saw.*" But though many MSS. have the verb, and all the older editions besides, the best codices omit it. Norzi testifies that it was absent from all the old MSS. It is therefore spurious.

To the present topic belongs the critical use of the Masorah. The only part of it to which we may now make special allusion is the *K'ris* in the margin. The Masorah presents in many cases readings in the margin by the side of those in the text. The Jews always prefer the *K'ris.* Others have in every case preferred the *c'thibs.* But these extremes are untenable.

A safer rule is, that the reading is to be preferred which agrees best with the context, and is supported by ancient versions.

Thus in Isaiah ix. 2, we read, "Thou hast multiplied the nation and not increased the joy," according to the *c'thib* or textual reading לֹא. But there is a *K'ri* or marginal particle לוֹ, *to it,* instead of the like sounding negative, "Thou hast enlarged the nation, thou hast increased joy *to it.*" As the most important ancient versions favour the latter, and it agrees best with the context, we have little hesitation in fol-

lowing it along with Lowth, Gesenius, De Wette, Knobel, Alexander, and others.

Again, in Psalm c. 3, we have the words "it is he that hath made us *and not we ourselves*," וְלֹא אֲנַחְנוּ. But the *K'ri* has לוֹ instead of לֹא, *and we are his.* Here the marginal reading is preferable. It agrees better with the subsequent context, and has more important versions in its favour. If the *c'thib* be the true reading, which we do not believe, it should be rendered, *when we were not*, *when we had no existence.* The English version of it cannot be received.

As to *the correction of the scribes* and *the taking away of the scribes* we receive the emendations as right; but they are of trifling value. The *grammatical*, *orthographical*, and *euphemistical* annotations of the Masoretes should not be adopted.

CHAPTER XXVI.

CRITICAL CONJECTURE.

A FIFTH source of readings for the purpose of emendation is, *critical conjecture.*

A distinction has been made between *theological* and *critical* conjecture. The former means the proposed emendation of a passage for the purpose of supporting a favourite religious tenet. The latter is the attempted restoration of the text, without reference to theological dogma, where external and internal evidence are considered too scanty to bring back the original words; or where such testimony is wholly wanting. If theological conjecture were adopted, it would soon open the door to corruption. Unscrupulous partisans would speedily introduce many changes into the Bible. They would give a bias to places, more or less marked in favour of their own creed. The number of passages supposed to need emendation would be increased. Many parts of the Bible would be suspected. The book would become an uncertain rule of faith. It could not be appealed to as a standard capable of settling all disputes in theology. Every one might then believe or disbelieve as best suited his own principles. The prejudices of party or sect would influence the treatment of the sacred records. According to the complexion of creed would be the character of the changes proposed.

It was once the opinion of divines that conjectures in regard

to the text of the Old Testament are unwarrantable and impious. They were regarded as an innovation on the language of holy writ. In modern times however this position has been modified or abandoned. Some indeed have gone to the opposite extreme, affirming that conjectures are as allowable in Scripture as in the case of any other book. There is no doubt that critical conjecture is a thing that should be resorted to very sparingly. The most stringent necessity alone can justify it. Wherever there is but *one copy* of an ancient work conjecture is indispensable, because no copy can ordinarily be transcribed without mistake; and whatever errors are committed must unavoidably be propagated in all transcripts taken from the copy. Even where there may be several MSS., all copied from one and the same, the necessity for conjecture remains, because they are merely equivalent to a single copy. This holds good with respect to some heathen writings, where conjecture must be employed. In proportion to the number of external copies, and the materials of external evidence, does the necessity for conjecture decrease.

Is then the mass of authorities in regard to the Old Testament of such a nature as to warrant the exclusion of critical conjecture? We believe not. The causes of error with regard to the Old Testament are numerous and important. The extreme antiquity of the canonical books, and the changing history of the nation by which they were transcribed and preserved, must be considered. All the Hebrew MSS. too belong to one *recension*. They are all *Masoretic* and of *recent* date. Nor do the most ancient versions wholly supply the want of very old Hebrew MSS., since those versions, such as the Septuagint, have greatly suffered in their own texts. Though the materials of Old Testament criticism be ample in one respect, *their nature and age* detract from the value attaching to mere quantity. The books had suffered very early in their text; and it is impossible to restore them

now to their original form by the help of external evidence. What shall be said, for example, of those places in the Old Testament where positive contradictions exist? What shall be said of names, numbers, genealogies, events, recorded so differently, that one or other statement of them must be incorrect? Disguise the fact as men may, the received Masoretic text, which is exhibited for the most part in all known MSS., makes writers assert different and contradictory things of the same person or event. There are not a few such phenomena in the books of the Old Testament, whose existence was ignored as long as it could be; or which were explained into agreement by the most arbitrary methods of exposition. But the light of modern criticism has brought them forth to the full day; and there they stand to the dismay of the feeble pietist, who would fain shut his eyes to their existence, or take to the stale shifts which once sufficed to force them into harmony.

Now it is precisely in these passages that the materials for correction are meagre. In some, there is not a single various reading either in MS., version, or quotation. What then is to be done? Shall the pure text of the Old Testament be disfigured? Shall these passages be allowed to remain as they are, though they are manifestly erroneous? No. Critical conjecture must be resorted to. A sober judgment must try to rectify these gross improprieties. Contradictions must be removed at all hazards; unless it be believed that they stood in the text at the very first. If they did not, as most suppose, they will be carefully and cautiously taken away. Let one place be corrected by another, where two are inconsistent. Let the analogy of faith be consulted. Let the connexion be carefully scrutinised. Let the judgment of former critics be looked to. In short, let all things be duly weighed with caution and care, and an attempt be made to restore the text as nearly as possible to its original condition. Too much vigilance cannot be exercised.

We are aware that all this may sound strange to the dogmatic literalism which takes *form* and *essence* to be inseparable; and holds by a view of verbal inspiration that cannot be defended. But let slavish literalism give forth its advice, and we shall see whether it be superior. Till then, and we suppose even after, in cases of *absolute necessity*, we will resort to critical conjecture. In the Old Testament such cases do arise. Every critic knows them. They are patent and palpable facts, which it were sheer folly to ignore.

It is needless to argue against the application of critical conjecture *in every case*, from the abuse of it by many; as it is admitted on all hands that an argument of that sort is worthless. It is unfortunate that there has been such abuse, but where is the good that has not been abused? Men *will* be rash, unskilful, ignorant, presumptuous. They *will* meddle with things that abhor their impure touch. They will not act with impartiality and calmness befitting serious things. They will give license to their imagination, or indulge their critical acumen. Human nature is always erring. We sigh over the groundless conjectures introduced into parts of the Old Testament text by Cappell, Kennicott, Houbigant, Lowth, Michaelis, and others. We deprecate the injurious influence of their unwarrantable interference with the text. They abused critical conjecture. Let us be warned by their example, and use their weapon *only* where an urgent necessity for it appears. Where external evidence fails or is not sufficient, let *a strong internal* evidence call for and justify conjecture. Here it is legitimate. Here in safe hands it will be seasonable and serviceable.

The Masoretes themselves have not refrained from critical conjecture. They have put forward סְבִירִין here and there on the readings of the Bible, which are commonly placed on the outer margin. With all their superstitious reverence for the letter, they could not but see that in some cases the text might

be improved; though MS. authority be silent, or nearly so. And their example may be safely followed.

As to rules on this point, none can be given, none at least that are of any use to the critic. Those that have been proposed are nothing else than a few general observations of a negative kind, which have no pretension to the name or character of *canons*. They are such as would occur to any person of reflection, as cautions to be observed.

It is laid down, in the first place, that conjectures and corrections are not to be made rashly in those passages where the present Hebrew text plainly agrees with all or most MSS. of the ancient fathers, interpreters, and paraphrasts, unless perhaps, the received reading necessarily exhibits a sense that is false, absurd, insipid, contrary to the preceding or following context or to other passages of Scripture, and opposed to the analogy of faith.

Secondly, In places where it is doubtful whether our present Hebrew text agrees with the reading which the Seventy or other ancient interpreters and paraphrasts followed, we must not rashly attempt conjectures and corrections, unless the received reading give a sense which is necessarily perplexed, confused, diluted, badly agreeing with the preceding or following context, or inconvenient from any other just cause.

Thirdly, A conjecture or correction of this sort should be such as to make the sense of a passage plainer and more coherent, more consonant with the analogy of faith and other Scriptures.

Fourthly, It ought to be of a kind to shew that the copyist might have readily fallen into a mistake—that he might easily have missed the true reading for that which we deem suspicious and needing emendation.

Fifthly, The correction or conjecture should not be taken into the text and substituted for an ancient reading; but should be set down in the margin or opposite page. It should at least

be kept separate, so that the reader might be left free to follow it or not.

Such are the laws or conditions laid down by Cappellus,* agreeably to which critical conjecture should be exercised. In practice they will not be found of much use. They are too general to be really serviceable. They are cautionary and vague. We fear that they will not restrain a bad critic, any more than they will guide a good one. The one will fail in applying them; the other can do without them. Cappellus himself was not restrained by them from baseless conjectures; and his disciples have not been more successful.

One or two examples of critical conjecture may perhaps be useful. In 2 Kings ix. 27, we read that Jehu pursued Ahaziah by the way of the garden house, and said, "Smite him also in the chariot. *And they did so* at the going up to Gur." Here something is supposed to have been omitted. The Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic *do* supply a verb. But they differ as to *the place* they put it in. It is probable therefore that their attempts at correction are not successful. The Septuagint leads to the original and true reading, viz. instead of הכהו, וַיַּכֻּהוּ, ה having arisen out וי. The sense then is—"Him also; and they smote him," &c.—language suited to the hasty ferocity of Jehu.

In 2 Kings x. 1, we read that Jehu wrote letters and sent to Samaria to the rulers of Jezreel, &c. Here the term *Jezreel* is evidently wrong. The Septuagint, Josephus, and one MS. of Kennicott have *Samaria* instead. This is substantially right. The original seems to have been וַיִּשְׁלַח מִיִּזְרְעֶאל אֶל שָׂרֵי שֹׁמְרוֹן, whence the present reading arose.

In 2 Kings viii. 16 are the words וִיהוֹשָׁפָט מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה, which make the fifth year of Jehoram and the fifth of Jehoshaphat coincident, contrary to iii. 1. They must have been inserted at first by mistake. There are also some authorities for their omission.

* Critica Sacra, vol. ii. p. 1013, et seq. ed. Vogel and Scharfenberg.

By comparing 2 Chron. xv. 19 with 1 Kings xv. 16, it will be seen that the text in Chronicles is corrupt. The two cannot be reconciled in any way yet attempted. The word *thirty* should be expunged.

A few examples may be also furnished of *the needless* application of critical conjecture.

In 2 Chron. xvii. 6 Jehoshaphat is said to have taken away the high places and groves out of Judah. But in 1 Kings xxii. 43 it is said, "nevertheless the high places were not taken away; for the people offered and burnt incense yet in the high places." Besides, in 2 Chron. xx. 33 it is written, "Howbeit the high places were not taken away; for as yet the people had not prepared their hearts unto the God of their fathers." Hence Cappell concludes, that in xvii. 6 for וְעוֹד should be read וְלֹא, so that the sense might be, "his heart was lifted up in the ways of God, and yet he did not take away the high places," &c.

Here the text needs no reforming hand, if the distinction be observed between high places dedicated to the true God, and those consecrated to idol-worship. In 1 Kings xxii. 43, the writer speaks merely of *illegal* worship; *not* the worship of the true God in the temple at Jerusalem which the law of Moses enjoined. The hearts of the people were not yet fully prepared for legal worship. Their religion had not led them so far as to see that they ought to repair to Jerusalem. But in 2 Chron. xx. 33 and xvii. 6 the language refers to *idolatrous* worship. Accordingly the text should be left undisturbed.

Again, in 1 Kings vi. 1, it is stated that Solomon began to build his temple 480 years after the children of Israel had come out of Egypt. Cappell would alter this into 580, thinking that the chronology requires it. The Septuagint has 440. Seyfarth would make it 880. But there is good reason for abiding by the received text. A careful computation of times

will vindicate its accuracy. Accordingly Thenius* has shown by a minute induction of particulars, that 480 has a right to stand where it is.

There are many other passages in the books of Kings and Chronicles where the true readings have disappeared; and where even the versions give no assistance in finding them. In Ezra and Nehemiah there are also several. Indeed scarcely any book is wholly free from them. But they are not so numerous as some may be ready to think. They have been unnecessarily multiplied.

As to the ulterior question whether passages properly contradictory were *at first* in different books, and whether therefore it be not unnecessary to attempt the emendation of one or other passage in all such cases, it does not at present lie before us. Different views of it have been held. The most recent researches go to the opposite extreme of that followed by the older critics, viz. a want of anxiety about harmonising all contradictions in the Old Testament, inasmuch as some at least are supposed to have stood there originally. If the Masoretic text be upheld as genuine in every case, a position which some approach to in the present day, the credibility of the original writers will suffer occasionally. The subject is of great importance. It demands investigation, because it affects the momentous questions of *canonicity* and *inspiration*.

* Die Bücher der Koenige erklärt, u. s. w. p. 56, et seq.

CHAPTER XXVII.

APPLICATION OF THE VARIOUS SOURCES OF CRITICISM.

When the sources of criticism are divided in their testimony respecting the reading of a passage, as is generally the case, many circumstances have to be considered in determining the original words.

The first thing which demands attention is, the proper adjustment of *external* witnesses with a view to ascertain what may be gathered from them unitedly. What reading do they favour when compared and contrasted with one another? To which form of the text do they incline as a whole? It is seldom that they are *equally* divided in authority. When set over against each other, added or subtracted, on what side do they preponderate?

The next thing is, to consider the *internal* evidence. How is the sense affected by this reading or by that? Which is more suitable in the particular connexion? Which agrees better with other places?

Let us now look at these two processes separately, though they are not often followed just in this order. In practice they are frequently mixed up together. They are not kept apart. They act and react materially. They influence one another in a greater or less degree. In endeavouring to ascertain the bearing and preponderance of external testimony, internal evi-

dence lends its aid, it may be unconsciously to the critic himself. And in investigating internal evidence by itself, the leaning of the external is seldom forgotten. We believe therefore that the two commonly go together to some extent. They affect each other in a greater or less degree. Perhaps it could not be otherwise. Possibly it were not practicable to separate them entirely. And even if it were, it might not be desirable.

Many writers have tried to frame *general rules*, by which an accurate judgment may be formed concerning various readings. But we are satisfied that such rules as we have seen propounded are of little if any use. No one is guided by them in practice. Nor can they secure an *accurate judgment* in all cases. A few observations only we venture to make, with a view of inducing proper precaution on the part of those who are occupied with the settlement of the text, rather than of actually guiding to a right decision in each particular case. *Proper canons* in relation to this subject we have never found. They may be so called, but they are not canons in reality. They serve for the most part to shew what the right reading is not, rather than what it is. And they are uniformly so general and vague, necessarily perhaps, that they fail to render efficient aid in all the varieties of individual cases.

We shall suppose therefore, that the critic has got the best forms of the texts belonging to ancient versions; that he has settled the ages, countries, and characters of the principal MSS. hitherto collated; that he has the parallels in right order; that quotations of various kinds are properly understood. Having all this apparatus, he comes to a passage where there are various readings, and where his authorities disagree among themselves. What then must he do? How can he proceed? Are there definite rules by which he may at once test and decide the respective claims of each reading? We fear not. In perplexing cases he must be content with conclusions slightly probable.

It will be understood first of all, that the critic is at liberty, where circumstances appear to require it, to depart from the present vowel points and accents. Their late origin must plead for this license. Of course they have their weight as witnesses, and should not be lightly or rashly abandoned; but as the most ancient interpreters frequently forsake them, the critic may do the same for just and proper causes. It will also be understood that the critic is at liberty to separate words which have been joined together; and on the contrary, to divide words into two, if considerations present themselves warranting such alteration.

He may also make a better division of verses and chapters in particular places.

Remembering then that these expedients may be lawfully employed with regard to the text when he sees a necessity for them, the critic looks,—

To *the number* of witnesses supporting a reading.

To their critical character.

To their age.

To their independence of one another.

It is obvious that testimonies should be counted. Number should not be despised. But it is as obvious, that they should be *weighed* as well as counted. Their *critical character* and worth should be attended to. This consists mainly in the uniform aim of a version to furnish a faithful and true representation of *the original.* This is most visible in such documents as contain the original text; then in the versions of Aquila, Jerome, the Peshito, the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and sometimes in the Septuagint. In addition to the critical character of the documents containing a certain reading, the age of them comes to be considered. Or antiquity, instead of being taken by itself, may be included in their critical character. It may be viewed as a constituent part of it. The older the better, other things being equal. The next particular is their

independence one of another. This enhances the value of the testimony belonging to each. But if one has suffered from contact with another, the number of the witnesses may be reduced, two resolving themselves into one.

The external testimonies being adjusted, their leanings on the whole to one reading being perceived or their superior support being assigned to its proper object, the critic turns his attention to the probability inherent in a well attested reading that the original author wrote in a certain manner, and not otherwise.

In determining such probability, great caution is requisite. The sense as gathered from the context is the main thing. We must proceed on the supposition that the writer meant to conform to the common laws of thought, by using words that give a good sense—one suited to his purpose, consistent with other passages, and historically correct. We must presume that he meant to write intelligibly for those whom he had in view. It is true that many limitations and peculiarities must be remembered in thus judging of the writer's conformity to the ordinary laws of thought and composition. Intelligibility and perspicuity may be urged too far. The mode of writing peculiar to an author is affected by and partly depends upon previous habits and influences. To later ages also there may be difficulties and contradictions where the original readers found none. Besides the Hebrew language being unlike our own, and its genius somewhat irregular, allowances must be made for phenomena that arise out of its very nature. Symmetry and smoothness must not be expected every where; especially as we are not thorough masters of a dialect so venerable as that in which the earliest records of the race are written.

Again, the critic has to look to the probability in favour of one reading having given rise to others. If he can perceive one which might more naturally lead to the others than any of the others to it, that one presents an inherent claim to

be considered the original and true reading. Here however some acuteness is necessary; while *ingenuity* may probably mislead. A lively fancy may betray a critic into the most arbitrary assumptions. He may think he sees the one which gave rise to the rest, when he is wholly in error. It is of great importance not only to be well acquainted with the Hebrew language, but with the peculiarities of style and diction belonging to the individual writer. The class of composition to which his work belongs, the parallelism of members if he wrote poetry, the point of view he took, the writer he may have imitated in some parts, even the locality where he wrote and the occasion that gave rise to his writing—all these should not be neglected in determining the reading which would most easily give rise to others. We shall close these remarks with the simplest and most correct rules which have occurred to us:—

1. A reading found in all critical documents is commonly the right or original one.

2. When the Masoretic text deviates from the other critical documents, and when these documents agree in their testimony quite independently of one another, the reading of the latter is preferable.

3. If the documents disagree in testimony, the usual reading of the Masoretic text should be preferred, even though a majority of the Hebrew MSS. collated cannot be quoted in its favour.

4. A reading found in the Masoretic text alone, or in the sources of evidence alone, independently of the Masoretic text, is suspicious.

5. If the MSS. of the original text disagree with one another, *number* does not give the greater weight, but other things, such as age, country, &c. aided by internal grounds.

6. The more difficult reading is generally preferable to the easier one.

7. A reading more consonant with the context, with the design and style of the writer, and with the parallelism in prophetic and poetical books, is preferable.

8. Every reading *apparently* false, vicious, absurd, containing a contradiction, is not on that account *actually* incorrect.

9. It is possible that a reading which has no more than one or two witnesses in its favour, if it be intrinsically good, may be worthy of adoption.

10. It is possible that in some places the true reading may be preserved in none of the sources. If there be strong reasons for thinking so, critical conjecture should be resorted to.

Such seem to us the most useful circumstances that deserve to be remembered and acted upon by the critic. We cannot call them *canons* for determining various readings. They are hints and cautions on the subject. They might easily be multiplied. But we are convinced that theory is of no use here. The very examples given by such as have accumulated what they call *rules* for ascertaining the true reading often shew that the rules are worthless, because the examples terminate in the adoption of readings as true which are really incorrect. The application, if it have been rightly conducted, proves the inutility or badness of the rules in question.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

EXAMINATION OF VARIOUS PASSAGES.

We shall now examine various passages in the Old Testament where the reading has been disputed. The evidence of versions, parallels, quotations, MSS., and also critical conjecture will be applied to them, in order that the original words may be exhibited. In this manner the reader will see the mode in which the various sources of emendation are employed. Perhaps this application of them will be more serviceable than all the rules which have been given. Here practice alone will produce skill and tact.

25th Psalm.

This psalm is one of those styled alphabetical. The verses begin with the different letters of the Hebrew alphabet in their order. But the alphabetical arrangement is incomplete in the present case. The first two verses begin with א, while ו and ק are omitted. There are also two verses beginning with ר; while the last verse begins with פ after the preceding one had closed with ת.

In consequence of these irregularities, critics have set themselves to amend and restore the Psalm. Wishing to make it strictly alphabetical, they have indulged in various conjectures for that purpose.

The first departure from the regular alphabetical structure is at the commencement of the second verse, where אֱלֹהַי stands, instead of a word beginning with ב. Hence arises the conjecture that אֱלֹהַי belongs to the preceding verse, leaving the second to begin with בְּךָ. No MS. or version has this emendation; but many critics from Cappell to Hitzig adopt it. Or, it has been thought that אֱלֹהַי and בְּךָ should be transposed, leaving the verse to begin with the latter, and אֱלֹהַי to belong to it still.

The second departure from alphabetical regularity is the want of a verse commencing with ו. This is rectified by reading in the fifth verse וְאוֹתְךָ instead of אוֹתְךָ, and making a new verse begin with it. In favour of this reading are three MSS. of Kennicott, one of De Rossi *a prima manu*, as also the Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, and Arabic. Kennicott and De Rossi receive the emendation at once.

The third departure is the want of ק at the beginning of a verse. To remedy this, Venema and Michaelis read the first word of the eighteenth verse קִרְאָה instead of ראה. There is no authority for this; nor is the deficient letter restored in any other way in any ancient MS. or version.

The fourth irregularity is at the nineteenth verse, which begins with ר the same as the preceding verse. Three of Kennicott's MSS. omit the nineteenth verse altogether.

The last irregularity is in the twenty-second verse, which begins with פ quite out of order, because after ת, and superfluous also, because there is a פ verse in its proper place.

The first question which arises is, is it likely that the Psalm was composed by the author with a strict adherence to alphabetical arrangement? So many critics have at once concluded. They take it for granted that the writer left the Psalm quite regular, because it is now alphabetical *for the most part*. But they seem to be hasty in their assumption. There

are reasons against them which they do not appear to have thought of. These are well stated by Hengstenberg.

1. Irregularities of the kind occur in all the alphabetical Psalms. And yet these are the very ones in which they were most unlikely to occur. If anything could have kept an ode or poem in the state in which it proceeded from the author, the alphabetical arrangement was the likeliest means of doing it. Its regularity and compactness would have prevented injuries from happening to the text. And yet it is assumed that *all* the alphabetical Psalms have suffered. Transcribers tampered with them all at a very early period. Surely if this rule of proportion be applied to the Psalms generally, the number of errors in their text must be very large. If copyists were careless in respect to those Psalms which are *the least* likely to admit of detriment to their text, they must have been far more careless with regard to such as presented no artificial arrangement to shield them from injury. Are the critics who set about remedying the text of this Psalm prepared to carry their ideas into the book generally? Do they even suppose that all the Psalms, besides the alphabetical, suffered as much as they? And yet consistency would lead them to believe that the others suffered immensely more from the incompetence and carelessness of transcribers.

2. There are gradations among the deviations in particular Psalms. There are cases in which only a single irregularity occurs. There are cases in which there is nothing more than approximation to alphabetical arrangement. And there are cases in which the alphabetical arrangement is directed not so much to the first word, as to *the number* of the verses.

3. There are special reasons in this Psalm why no alterations should be attempted. In relation to the ק and ר verses, the author evidently sacrificed the form to the sense. He could not follow the alphabetical arrangement without constraint;

and therefore he sacrificed it to the connection of ideas. Had there been no second verse beginning with ר, the omission of ק might have been accidental; but as the case now is, it is most unlikely that the ק could have been left out by mistake, and another ר inserted in its place by mistake. The first and last verses are peculiar, since they consist each of but one clause; while all the other verses have two. They stand out from the alphabetical series, and together constitute one sentence which is the subject of the Psalm, viz. prayer for deliverance from enemies.*

Believing for these reasons that the Psalm proceeded as it is from the author himself, all emendatory criticism must be misapplied to it. It refuses to allow conjectural attempts to restore it, as is imagined, to right order. Indeed they are worse than useless. They are mischievous. They mar and spoil the sense, as might easily be shewn. Thus from an entire misapprehension of the first verse, and the peculiar position it occupies out of the alphabetical series, announcing the theme of the Psalm at the beginning, it has been imagined that it wants a clause, which is taken from the second verse, viz. אֵל אֲבוֹשָׁה. After this the second verse thus denuded of a part of itself is made to begin with בְּךָ instead of אֱלֹהַי. By such arbitrary procedure, two verses are made to come forth, whose sense is,—

1. Unto thee Jehovah, my soul will I lift up;
   I shall not be ashamed.

2. In thee my God have I trusted;
   Mine enemies shall not triumph over me.

After this follows the third verse unmutilated—

3. Likewise all those waiting for thee shall not be ashamed;
   Ashamed shall be the traitors without cause.

---

* See Hengstenberg's Commentary on the Psalms, vol. i. pp. 428, 429. English version.

Compare with this the sense of the verses as they stand in the text, and it will appear on which side is the preference.

1. Unto thee Jehovah, my soul will I lift up;
2. My God, in thee have I trusted, let me not be ashamed;
   Let not mine enemies triumph over me.
3. Yea all those waiting for thee shall not be ashamed;
   Ashamed shall be the traitors without cause.

In the latter case, the psalmist first expresses his fixed determination to seek protection in God. Next, he indicates that it has been exercised already, *therefore* he may not be put to shame. The mention of being put to shame immediately suggests the general maxim on which he grounds his prayer for deliverance, shewing that he does not ask for any special dispensation in his own behalf;

Yea all who wait on thee shall not be ashamed;
Ashamed shall be the traitors without cause.

But in the former case, where conjecture arbitrarily amends the text, this connexion of ideas is spoiled: "I shall not be ashamed," or rather, "let me not be ashamed," is separated by an entire verse from the third, although it should manifestly be in close sequence to it; for the emphatic *yea* at the commencement of the third verse introducing the verb *ashamed*, shews that the speaker passes at once from his own particular case "let me not be ashamed, let not mine enemies triumph over me," to the case of all in similar circumstances with himself *not being ashamed.* But it is unnecessary to dwell on such unwarranted dismemberment of the Psalm before us. Far better is the text, as all copies exhibit it, than as it comes forth from the hand of the reformer. It appears to have now all the regularity it ever had. Each verse that comes within the alphabetical series has two clauses; the first and last verses standing apart. The second verse and the fifth do *not* at present consist of three clauses; nor is it likely that they were

ever meant to be separated into three. The Masoretes have divided them properly.

145*th Psalm.*

This Psalm is also alphabetical. It is observable, however, that a verse beginning with נ is wanting. Hence the Psalm is at once imagined to have had at first a נ verse, which has dropped out of the text through the carelessness of transcribers. On consulting ancient authorities, one MS. of Kennicott, viz. 142 at the bottom of the page has a verse beginning with נ, supplying the apparent omission, viz. נֶאֱמָן יְהוָה בְּכָל דְּבָרָיו וְחָסִיד בְּכָל מַעֲשָׂיו, "Jehovah is faithful in all his words, and holy in all his works." The Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, and Arabic versions have the same supplement to the common text.

The question now is, was the Psalm originally perfect in its alphabetical structure, the verse in question having been unaccountably dropped out of all existing collated Masoretic copies except a modern one, though retained in the Septuagint; or, has the Septuagint supplied the fancied omission through a mistaken notion that there was a deficiency?

There is no probability that the supplied verse was originally in the text. Agreeably to the analogy of other alphabetical Psalms, the structure is not perfect throughout. Form was sacrificed to the sense. The writer did not put himself under restraint, for the sake of external regularity of structure in the ode. The chief motive for the omission of the letter נ seems to have been the designed arrangement of the whole into three equal stanzas, each containing seven verses. Hence one of the twenty-two letters of the alphabet had to be dropped. The Septuagint obviously borrowed the supplied verse from the seventeenth which follows, merely changing צַדִּיק *righteous* into נֶאֱמָן *faithful*, which latter word was derived from Psalm cxi. 7. The other ancient translations quoted followed the Seventy in this addition to the text.

At the end of the Psalm an additional verse is found in twelve MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi, in two as at first written, one as it now is; as also in the Soncino Bible. It is as follows:—וַאֲנַחְנוּ נְבָרֵךְ יָהּ מֵעַתָּה וְעַד עוֹלָם הַלְלוּ יָהּ, "But we will bless the Lord from henceforth even for ever. Praise ye the Lord." This verse is evidently spurious; and was probably taken from prayer-books, as De Rossi supposes, for he found it in several.

Psalm xvi. 10.

In the received text we find the word חֲסִידֶיךָ in Psalm xvi. 10, though it is pointed with the vowels of the singular חֲסִידְךָ, and a marginal note states that *yod* is superfluous. The difference between the singular and the plural is thought to be important in this instance, because the former means *Christ*, the latter *the pious* in general. Hence most Jews adopt *the plural*, most Christians *the singular*, as might have been expected. Great zeal has been displayed in defending the latter against the Jews, with accusations of their corrupting the text for their own purpose, lest it should apply to Christ. Perhaps the polemic indignation of some Christian authors has led them too far in this matter. They might have spared their vituperations till it had been proved that the Jews had wilfully falsified the text. It is matter of regret that the point should have been argued as a theological one; for in that case, passions and prejudice are apt to run away with sober reason. It is a critical question, and nothing else; which ought very carefully to be kept apart from the debatable field of dogmatic theology.

We must say at the outset, that we do not agree with those writers who make a great deal out of the difference between the two readings, as if it were *essential*. It is much the same as to *sense* which of the two be adopted. The singular refers directly to Christ; the plural, in referring to the saints, includes Christ; for *he* is their head and representative. Even

the singular, as Alexander observes,* is really collective, and includes the whole class of God's chosen and favoured ones, whose head Christ is. In this way it is apparent that there is little real difference between the two readings. There is therefore no cause for invectives against the Jews with their plural reading; as if they had expelled Christ from the passage. He may be there still, though the plural be adopted. And though the textual reading be unquestionably that one to which the vowels should be adapted, yet the Masoretes direct the singular to be read, shewing at least that *all* the Jews did not favour the plural.

Hengstenberg regards the plural as the original reading because—1. It is supported by the preponderance of external authorities. The testimony of MSS. is chiefly on its side; and that cannot be outweighed by the testimony of ancient versions.

2. The plural, as the more difficult reading might be readily exchanged for the singular, which is easier.†

The first of these arguments is weighty in favour of the plural reading. Its force cannot be denied. Against it may be put the fact, that 263‡ MSS. of Kennicott and de Rossi, eight *a prima manu* and three as now altered, have the singular. These however are by no means the majority of MSS., as Kennicott intimates when he says that the plural reading is even now found only in a few of the latest MSS. Auriville repeats the same incorrect statement. They are the minority of all the MSS. written before printing, for they are very little more than the half of such as have been collated by Kennicott and De Rossi.

As far then as MSS. are concerned, the plural is better supported than the singular, as Hengstenberg truly affirms.

* The Psalms translated and explained by J. A. Alexander, vol. i. p. 118.

† Commentary on the Psalms, vol. i. p 251. English translation.

‡ Jahn erroneously says 265.

On the other hand, all the ancient versions exhibit the singular. The Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, Chaldee paraphrase have it. Indeed no old translation has any other reading. It is also in Jerome, the Babylonian Talmud, Midrash Tehillim, Yalkuth Simeon, and various Rabbinical works. In the New Testament, the apostles Peter and Paul quote the passage in the singular. De Rossi also enumerates fifty ancient editions which have it.

Auriville* states that Jacob Ben Chayim was the first editor who put the plural in the text, with a circle referring to a marginal note to the effect that י is superfluous. Bomberg's edition which he superintended was printed in 1525, 1526. But in this assertion he is mistaken, for the plural was in the Neapolitan Psalter published in 1490. It is probable however that succeeding editors followed Ben Chayim down to the present day. It is impossible at this time to discover the motive or motives which led the first editor to depart from the printed text which preceded him. Did he follow the ancient Masorah in giving the plural? or did he put the plural in the text without authority? What led Ben Chayim to put in the margin the Masoretic note that yod is redundant? Is that his own opinion? These are questions to which different answers will be given. We think that the Neapolitan editor and Ben Chayim must have had such ancient authority as appeared to them overwhelming for the insertion of the plural in the text; while the latter honestly put the note of the Masoretes that the *yod* should be omitted. He gave the Masoretic opinion in the margin; but the reading of ancient copies in the text. On the whole, we are inclined to consider the singular the true authentic reading, rather than the plural. The weight of ancient testimony is in favour of it. *Internal* evidence is also on the side of *the singular*. Throughout the

* Dissertationes ad sacras litteras et philol. orient. pertinentes, p. 123, et seq.

Psalm one person appears as the speaker; and therefore the plural does not suit the context. Hengstenberg indeed argues that the plural as the more difficult reading might be exchanged for the singular by such as knew not what to do with it, especially as an individual speaker appears throughout; but to this we reply in his own words, that it is absurd to extend this rule of criticism so far as to leave out of account the entire weight of external authorities.*

Though there is no reasonable ground for dogmatising on this disputed question where able scholars such as Fischer, Stange, Bruns, De Wette, Ewald, Hengstenberg, advocate the plural, in opposition to the prevailing current of opinion among Christian writers, yet we cannot but adopt the singular.†

1 *Sam.* xvii. 12-31, *and* 55-58.

In the seventeenth chapter of the first book of Samuel two passages, the first of considerable length, have excited much attention. We shall advert to them separately.

xvii. 12-31.—These verses give an interesting account of David's being sent to the camp to visit his brethren; of his conversation with the men of Israel relative to Goliah's challenge, and their telling him of the reward offered by Saul to him who should conquer the Philistine; of Eliab's behaviour to his brother David on his making inquiry about what should be done to the victor; and of Saul's being made acquainted with what David had said, and sending for the latter.

The twenty verses in question have been considered by many an *interpolation* which the Hebrew text did not originally contain.

In favour of this view of them, both external and internal evidence has been adduced.

The Septuagint version omits them, at least in the Vatican

* Christologie des alten Testaments, vol. i. p. 168.

† See De Rossi, Scholia Critica in V. T. libros, p. 99.

copy. It would seem also from Kennicott's reasoning about the Alexandrine copy, that the transcriber of *it* had a MS. before him which wanted the verses. It is thought that the transcriber of the Alexandrine having written what is now in the eleventh verse, was beginning what is at present the thirty-second, when after writing *καὶ εἶπε Δαυίδ*, he perceived that either the Hebrew or some other Greek copy, or the margin of his own copy, had a number of intermediate verses. So without erasing *εἶπε* he proceeded to write the addition, thus leaving a decisive proof of his own interpolation.* In this manner Kennicott ingeniously reasons; and though we might take exception to his argumentation, we allow it to pass. We concede to him that the Alexandrine as well as the Vatican copy omitted the verses; or *should* rightly *have* omitted them, as not being in the MSS. from which they were transcribed.

On the other hand, all Hebrew MSS. all ancient versions except the Septuagint, and all ancient writers, witness in favour of the verses. Thus the external evidence for their authenticity is overwhelming.

But such as advocate their supposititiousness rely most on internal evidence. Let us hear their arguments:—

1. After David had been of so much service to the king, in causing the evil spirit to depart from him; after its being recorded how greatly Saul loved him, and that he had made him his armour-bearer; after the king had sent to Jesse to signify his intention of keeping his son with him, all which are particularly mentioned in the latter part of the preceding chapter, the account of his keeping his father's sheep afterwards, and being sent to his brethren on this occasion must appear to be somewhat improbable.

2. What is here said of the premium that Saul had offered

* The State of the printed Hebrew text, Dissertation the second, p. 422, et seq.

to him who should conquer the Philistine, is not well consistent with the account afterwards given.

3. Eliab's behaviour, as here represented, is not only remarkable, but unaccountable and absurd.

4. The inquiries of a young man, who is not said to have declared any intentions of accepting the challenge of the Philistine, would scarcely have been related to the king. So Kennicott, after Pilkington, argues.*

The arguments now adduced have much plausibility and force. It is hardly surprising that they have been pronounced unanswerable, as they have been by critics like Boothroyd. In consequence of them, Horsley was led to believe that the last ten verses of the preceding chapter relating to Saul's madness and David's introduction to the court on that occasion are misplaced. Let these ten verses, says he, be removed to a place between the ninth and tenth of the eighteenth chapter, and this seventeenth chapter be connected immediately with the thirteenth verse of the sixteenth chapter, and all inconsistency in the narrative will be removed. †

We have elsewhere ‡ stated some considerations against this solution, which need not be repeated here. It is not satisfactory. The difficulties of the narrative are not removed by it. The passage must either be an integral part of the Hebrew text as it now stands, or a spurious addition to it.

With all the thought we have been able to devote to this topic, we cannot suppose that the section was a later interpolation. No adequate reason for the later insertion of it in the original text has been given. It *might be* worked up, as Kennicott says, by some fanciful Rabbin; but it is most unlikely that so long a passage should be inserted in the margin of Hebrew copies and afterwards taken into the text. The

* State of the printed Hebrew text, Dissertation second, p. 420, et. seq.

† Biblical Criticism, vol. i. pp. 331, 332.

‡ Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 541, et seq.

Jews did not deal with copies of their sacred books after that fashion.

The general character of the books of Samuel leads, as we believe, to a solution of the difficulty. It is now admitted by all critics, even by Hävernick, that these books were partly compiled. Different materials were employed in their composition. Books of annals, registers, and oral tradition contributed to them. Their compilatory, fragmentary character appears unmistakeably in various parts.

Proceeding on this admitted ground, it may be inferred that *the original* writer of what is now the sixteenth chapter was different from the writer of the seventeenth chapter. The sources of the sixteenth and seventeenth chapters were not the same. The account of David given in the sixteenth chapter is very incomplete. It is brief and imperfect in itself. It was necessary to say something more of him and his parentage. The section before us therefore, or something like it, was needed. Accordingly, the compiler of the whole book took it from a source before him and placed it where it now is, without solicitude as to its nicely fitting the context. It has *the appearance* of disturbing the connexion, or at least of not being exactly adapted to it. But this seemed a small thing to the annalist. He knew that it presented a true and accurate account of a portion of David's history; and saw that there was no better place for it as a whole than the present one. It might have been inserted in places more *chronologically* appropriate by dividing and distributing the parts of it; but keeping it together, it was put where it now is. Nor is this the only place in the books of Samuel where passages do not *seem* to agree well with one another. Apparent contradictions have been adduced which must be accounted for on the same principle. The compilatory character of the books must be considered. The writer of the whole put together materials derived from various sources, without believing it to be either

necessary or essential to bring them into exact accordance in their historical sequence and relationship.

1 Sam. xvii. 55—xviii. 5.

These verses are also omitted from the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, and supposed to contradict the latter part of the sixteenth chapter. Hence many modern critics reject them as a later interpolation. It is unnecessary to give the reasons drawn from the context for their supposed spuriousness. They are similar to those detailed in the preceding section. The solution is the same as was applied to verses 12-31. But there is no real inconsistency. The verbs in the fifty-fifth and following verses should be rendered in the pluperfect. Some things are repeated, the mention of which would have interrupted the course of the narrative; and xviii. 2, 5 obviously refer to the commencement of what is related in xiv. 52. As was already said, the sixteenth and seventeenth chapters were taken from different documents; and the seventeenth chapter should terminate with what is now the fifth verse of the eighteenth.

1 *Sam.* vi. 19.

"And he smote the men of Bethshemesh, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people fifty thousand and three score and ten men: and the people lamented, because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter."

The extraordinary number of persons here specified, viz. 50,070 arrests the attention of every reader. It did not escape Tindal and Voltaire. Indeed it appears incredible. Bethshemesh was a small town. It could scarcely have had *five* thousand inhabitants, much less *fifty*. Neither could so many people belonging to the surrounding district have been gathered together in haste, and inhabitants be still left after the destruction of so many. Various ways of lessening the extrava-

gant number have been attempted. The original words are שִׁבְעִים אִישׁ חֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף אִישׁ, *i. e.* literally, *seventy men, fifty thousand men.* The Vulgate translates, "de populo septuaginta viros, et quinquaginta millia plebis." This view is adopted by Anton and Maurer, the latter of whom paraphrases thus: "et clade affecit ex Bethschamitis, quoniam arcam Jovae nimis curiose inspexerant, et clade affecit ex populo, (ex illis) septuaginta homines, (ex hoc) quinquaginta millia hominum." "*And he smote of the Bethshemites seventy men; of the people generally fifty thousand men.*"* According to this explanation, the Hebrew words commonly put together in one member of the sentence are separated; and in their separated state referred back to different clauses. But the method is far-fetched, artificial, unnatural.

Bochart renders it, "seventy men, fifty, viz. out of a 1000;" which must also be rejected.

The "Exegetisches Handbuch" of Höpfner and Augusti translates, "seventy out of 50,000," which is likwise unnatural.

Hassencamp, by removing the final mem of חֲמִשִּׁים, and putting it before the next word אֶלֶף, makes the phrase חֲמִשֵּׁי מֵאֶלֶף אִישׁ, *the fifth of each family.* But Tychsen properly objects to this interpretation, observing that אֶלֶף with אִישׁ never means any thing else in the Bible than a thousand men; and that each family of the seventy must thus have consisted of five men at least, which is improbable.

Kennicott's mode of rectifying the text is still more unsatisfactory. It was examined and refuted by Hassencamp.

De Rossi, after two unpublished Targums, translates, "seventy men equivalent to 50,000," *i. e.* the death of the seventy principal men of the place was equal to the destruction of 50,000. This is the least probable interpretation of all that have been proposed. It savours of the conceit of a Rabbin, rather than the character of the sacred writer. The text as it

* Commentarius Criticus Vet. Test. vol. i. p. 157.

stands appears to be corrupt. If it was meant to give the number 50,070 it ought to have been different, according to the construction of the Hebrew language. It should have been חֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְשִׁבְעִים אִישׁ or at least, שִׁבְעִים אִישׁ וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף אִישׁ.

Thus forced by the necessity of the case we look to ancient authorities respecting the reading of the place.

Three MSS. of Kennicott 84, 210, 418, and two others, viz. the Paris one cited by Houbigant, and that of Breithaupt cited at Jarchi's version, omit the three words meaning "fifty thousand men" leaving only "seventy men." Josephus omits the same, though elsewhere he often has larger numbers, not commonly smaller ones than the Hebrew text contains. Hence his testimony is weighty. The Syriac, with which the Arabic agrees, has 5070 instead of 50,070, but even then, the number is incredibly large. The Septuagint, Chaldee, and Vulgate have the common reading. Thus external evidence is in favour of the received text. Yet the internal necessity is so urgent, that the text must be pronounced corrupt. We agree with the five MSS. mentioned, and with such critics as Kennicott, Tychsen, Michaelis, Dathe, Hufnagel, Jahn, Thenius, &c. in thinking that the three words חֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף אִישׁ were a marginal gloss appended by some Rabbin, and afterwards taken into the text. They appear to have been written in the margin by one who thought that the seventy were *equivalent to* 50,000; as Tychsen* conjectures, and produces an allegorical gloss from the Talmud to the effect that every one of the seventy was equivalent to 50,000. Or we may suppose with Reinke† that the numeral letter ע = seventy stood at first in the text; that a reader or copyist may have found in another copy the letter נ = 50,000, and either written it in the margin of the text, or taken it into his MS. itself. We should then have in the Masoretic text, besides the original

* Tentamen, &c. p. 212.

† Beiträge zur Erklärung des alten Testaments, p. 125, et seq.

ע = seventy, the marginal reading of another MS. ס = 50,000. ע and ס might the more readily be exchanged on account of the two points like the two upper heads of the letter ע.

Either is a much more probable account of the origin of the marginal gloss than that given by Kennicott, which, though refuted by Hassencamp, is again quoted by Thenius.

This is not the only instance in which incredibly large numbers appear in the present text of the Old Testament.

Thus in 2 Chron. xvii. 14, &c. Jehoshaphat King of Judah is said to have had an army of 1,160,000 men besides those who were in the fenced cities throughout Judah (verse 19). The usual computation is, that the men capable of bearing arms are a fifth part of the population. This gives 5,800,000. But if any one considers the extent of territory which Judah comprehended, fifteen geographical miles from north to south, and eight from east to west, he will see that so many persons could not live in it. If there were a population as large in proportion in the kingdom of Israel, then must Palestine and the country east of Jordan, where were Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, have had about 15,000,000 of inhabitants.

Exaggerated numbers may also be found in 1 Sam. xv. 4; 1 Chron. xix. 7; xxi. 5; xxii. 14; 2 Chron. iii. 4; xiii. 3, 17, &c. &c. In adjusting these numbers, all existing sources of evidence are of no benefit. Various conjectural methods are followed in bringing them within the bounds of probability. Some suppose that they are now as they were originally; others that the passages have been corrupted. Reinke applies to them his great remedy, viz. that letters having been used for numbers were accidentally confounded from similarity of form, or other causes.

Psalm xxii. 17.

In this verse occurs the word כָּאֲרִי, which our translators

render, *they have pierced.* There are two other readings, viz. כארו and כרו. Let us see what external authority each of the three readings has.

1. כארו. This reading is found in 39 of Kennicott and 337 De Rossi; perhaps in 207 of Kennicott, at present in 242 of Kennicott, in the margin of 218; in the Complutensian Bible, in the Basel Psalter 1516, in the Polyglott Psalter of Potken 1518, in the margin of the Psalterium Quadruplex of Basel 1518, and in the margin of the Psalterium Quadruplex, Lugdun. 1530. Several writers state that they saw the same reading, or that it was found either in the text or margin of MSS. they mention. It is certain that there were good and ancient copies which formerly had it in the text, both from the great Masorah on Numb. xxiv. 9, which says that in some MSS. כארו was written in the text; and from Ben Chayim's statement in the Masorah *finalis* of Bomberg's Bible, "in some most accurate books I have found written in the text כארו, and in the margin כארי." Aquila followed the same reading in translating it ἤσχυναν. The Septuagint (ὤρυξαν), the Syriac, the Vulgate, Jerome, the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, had either כארו or the next reading כרו. To this reading are referred also those authorities in which is found *yod* with shurek י, being a vau curtailed, viz. cod. 1128 Rossi, the Plantin Bible 1571, the Antwerp Polyglott, Hutter's Bible 1587, the Wittemberg Psalter 1566, the Harmonic Psalter 1602.

The Plantin edition has in the margin כרה, and this variety of reading is indicated by a little circle in the Geneva Bible 1618 4to and 12mo; in the Polyglott Psalter of Basel 1518; in the sixfold Psalter of Leyden 1530.

There are also some MSS. that read כָּאֲרִי, *fodientes*, as if it were the participle of the verb, as 148 Kennicott or the Strasburgh Psalter from Oberlin's collation, 368 De Rossi. In the margin of the Basel Psalter 1516, this reading with *yod* is attributed to the Jews. The Chaldee in the Antwerp Polyglott seems to have had the participle.

Both readings, *i.e.* נָכְתִּין הֵיךְ כְּאַרְיָא are in the Targum of cod. 31 De Rossi; in the great Rabbinical Bible, and the London Polyglott. נָכְתִּין הֵיךְ אַרְיָוָא is in the Targum of an Octaplar Psalter, and אֵיךְ אַרְיָוֹת in the Targum of cod. 32 De Rossi.

2. כרו. This reading is in 649 Kennicott, a MS. written by a Christian, in the margin of two MSS. collated by Kennicott, viz. 539, 542; but De Rossi, who recollated them, says that the former, belonging to the thirteenth century, has it in a more recent character and blacker ink; the latter, belonging to the fifteenth century, has the same *K'ri* in a yellower character and from the same hand which wrote the Masorah, therefore from a Jew. It is also in the Wittemberg Psalter of 1566. It is a marginal *K'ri* in the Heidelberg Triglott Bible 1586; in a Geneva edition of the Psalms and Proverbs printed about 1616; in the Paris Psalter 1632; in the edition of the Psalms and Proverbs of Paris 1632, and in the Antwerp interlinear Bible of 1571. It is at the end among the various readings in Munster's Hebrew Bible 1536; in the Basel Psalter 1538; in that of 1547; and in the Antwerp Polyglott. But Munster's Bible intimates that the reading was among Christians alone and their copies. This too is the general opinion of the Jews, as we learn from Rabbi Joseph Kimchi and his son David. Galatinus says that the reading was still found in some very ancient MSS.; and Raymund Martini quotes a Rabbinical treatise in which it was among the *correctiones scribarum.*

3. כארי. The few MS. authorities quoted in favour of the preceding two leave the vast majority for this one. The whole weight of MSS. is on its side. The Masorah supports it. There are only two *Jewish* MSS. which are an exception in favour of כארו. The others that have the latter reading are doubtful, or suspicious, or corrected by another hand, or of Christian origin.

But all the ancient versions, except the Chaldee, favour

כארו. Thus the MSS. are almost all for No. 3, and the versions for No. 1. No. 2 has not a single primary MS.

As far therefore as relates to external evidence, the received reading must be preferred at once.

It is merely another form of it corrected, viz. כְּאַרְיֵה that is in 245 Kennicott and 554 of De Rossi *a prima manu*, and another form with *patach*, viz. כַּאֲרִי, which is in several MSS. and eight ancient editions.

It is in favour of the received text also that it is the more difficult reading. The others might have readily originated in it, but not the contrary. We have no doubt that the textual is the true reading, especially as the ancient translations are not against it. They may have rendered *the Masoretic* reading as they do.

It is matter of regret that many Christian writers should have employed this text as an instrument of accusation against the Jews, as if the latter had wilfully and maliciously corrupted it by changing the preterite plural of a verb, viz. כארו or כרו into the present reading. Certainly there does not appear to be any foundation for the charge. As far as we are able to judge they have preserved the original word.*

In regard to the meaning of כָּאֲרִי it appears to be "as the lion," like Isaiah xxxviii. 13. All other constructions are

* Justiniani in his Octapla Psalter (Genoa, 1516, fol.), who translates the usual reading *sicut leo*, has the following note :—"Sicut leo, manus meae et pedes mei, sive manus meas et pedes meos. Constructio defectiva, subaudiendumque impii tanquam leo manus meas et pedes meos foderunt, perforaverunt, male habuerunt, fixerunt, aut male tractaverunt. Siquidem verbum Hebraeum כארי *caari* quod aliqui interpretati sunt foderunt, compositum est ex litera similitudinem significante et ex nomine leonem significante. Nec assentio dicentibus Hebraeos hunc locum corrupisse, quod ex nostris arbitrant multi quum dicunt legendum abud Hebraeos כרו *caru* deducta voce a verbo כרה *cara* quod fodio sive figo, sive vincio significat. Loca enim omnia quae Hebraei corruperunt, studiosos hujus linguae non latent et ipse in nostris scholiis diffuse de illis disserui inter quae hic locus nec unquam numeratur."

objectionable, as Hengstenberg has ably shewn. It is true that the common rendering *they pierced*, and the reading on which it is founded (כארו) have been recently defended against Hengstenberg and his American follower Alexander; but we cannot agree with the advocate in question. His argumentation looks as if it were one-sided.*

There is much probability in the meaning assigned by Stuart to the verb הִקִּיפוּ *they pierced*—a sense which the root certainly has in Pihel; and we are inclined to adopt it.† In this manner all is plain, for the verb in the first clause is left to be understood in the second, of which many examples occur. If additional authority in favour of כָּאֲרִי meaning nothing else than *as a lion* were necessary, we might adduce that of Hupfeld, the learned Hebraist.‡

Judges xviii. 30.

This verse stands thus in the English version: "And the children of Dan set up the graven image: and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of Dan until the day of the captivity of the land." The proper name Manasseh stands thus in the common Masoretic text מְנַשֶּׁה, with a marginal note calling attention to *nun* suspended. Another reading drops the *nun* and has simply מֹשֶׁה, *Moses*. The inquiry then is, which of the two is the right reading.

In favour of מֹשֶׁה are 744 of De Rossi *at first*, as also two others *a prima manu*. Jerome has it; and therefore the present Vulgate. It would also appear that some copies of the Greek version formerly read *Moses*. Four in Paris, one in the Vatican, and an octateuch belonging to University College

* See the American Bibliotheca Sacra for Oct. 1851, p. 802, et seq.

† See Hebrew Criticisms by Moses Stuart in the Bibliotheca Sacra for January 1852, p. 51, et seq.

‡ "Ist unstreitig nicht anders als: *wie ein Löwe*," are his words in a letter to the author.

Oxford, have it. All other MSS. and versions have the received reading, the only difference in the MSS. being that 27, 9 *a prima manu*, and thirty-three editions have the letter *nun* inserted in its place; 16, and one *a prima manu*, present it in a little larger size than the other letters of the word; while the greater number of manuscript copies have it *suspended*. The weight of authority immensely preponderates in favour of *Manasseh*.

Yet notwithstanding the external evidence for *Manasseh*, it is likely that the other is the right reading. It is related in the Talmud* that this Gershom was the son of Moses; but that on account of his son Jonathan's idolatrous conduct he is called the son of Manasseh by inserting *nun*. Rabbi Tanchum attests the same thing, saying that the name was written with *nun* suspended, because Jonathan's conduct was unsuited to the dignity of Moses and consonant to that of Manasseh. In like manner Rabbi Solomon Ben Melek quoted by Norzi says, that the נ is *redundant*, because he was the son of Moses. Thus this tradition of the Jews is ancient and uniform. And it is likely to be true, because it is a testimony against themselves. They confess honestly that a letter was added, and give the reason of it. It was the honour of Moses which led them to make Jonathan the first priest of idolatry, not a grandson of the great law-giver, but a grandson of *Manasseh*. The *nun* must have been written very early with the name, as it is in all the most ancient versions.

2 *Chron.* xxii. 2.

Here it is said in the received text that Ahaziah was forty-two years old when he began to reign. But in 2 Kings viii. 26, it is written that he was two and twenty years old when he ascended the throne. The number 42 in Chronicles is in all Hebrew MSS. hitherto collated. It is also in the Vulgate.

* Bava Bathra, folio 109.

On the other hand, the margin of cod. 590 Kennicott, some editions of the Septuagint, as the Aldine, the Frankfort, and that in the Antwerp and Paris Polyglotts, a Greek translator in Origen's Hexapla, the Syriac and Arabic versions have 22. Most copies of the Seventy have 20, whence it is conjectured that καὶ δύο at first followed ἐτῶν εἴκοσι, and was negligently dropped.

The parallel passage in 2 Kings, and the age of Ahaziah's father at his death which was 40, make it necessary that the reading 22 should be taken into the text. The place must be corrupt. Kennicott conjectures* that the mistake was owing to one of the Hebrew numeral letters being mistaken for another, viz. כ for מ. Instead of כב it was changed by mistake into מב. It is more likely, that the letters being in the Samaritan character at the time when the Chronicles were written, one of them was taken for another, as the two denoting twenty and forty respectively are very similar. Jewish writers have tried to solve the difficulty in various ways; and the interpretations proposed by Christian authors, on the supposition that the text at present is uncorrupted, have been many; but they are very artificial and improbable.

Genesis i.

We have chosen this chapter, throughout which a considerable number of various readings occur, not because the general sense of it is much affected by any of them, but because an examination of it will illustrate an error often committed by the Samaritan scribes, as well as the scribes of those Hebrew copies from which the Septuagint version was made. There is an uniformity in the narrative. A certain order is perceptible throughout the chapter. But the writer did not bind himself absolutely to that order. Indeed the sacred authors never do so. It is not the case in the alphabetical Psalms. There is

* First Dissertation, p. 98.

no constraint; they exhibit perfect freedom in their movements. This is what might have been expected from the author of the Pentateuch who wrote at so early a period. He did not observe the extreme regularity which one living in an artificial age would be careful to maintain. A rigid attention to external form was not to be expected from the age in which Moses lived, the object he had in view, and the influences by which he was moved. But meddling scribes, observing deviations from the principle which *appears* to pervade the narrative of the creation, tried to remove them. They filled up what seemed to be wanting, transferred clauses from other verses, transposed, added, and subtracted words, for the purpose of having everything conformable to the one plan on which the writer *appeared* to construct his description. But their officious meddling is abhorrent to the ideas of him who wrote the Pentateuch. He was not guided by their minute artificialities. He did not think of observing the rounded regularity they wish to introduce into his simple narrative. Putting into it, as they do, more of the modern and the studied, they detract so far from the artless and the antique which characterised both the period and the man.

The first instance of a various reading which will exemplify these remarks is at the sixth verse, where the Septuagint places at the end, *καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως*, because in other instances, as in verses 9, 11, &c. this statement follows, "and God said." Accordingly the inference is drawn, that by some accident, the words וַיְהִי כֵן have been transferred to the end of the seventh verse from the end of the sixth. It is very hazardous to draw this conclusion on the sole authority of the Septuagint, where no necessity or exigency exists. In the seventh verse, it is related that God made the firmament, which, in the sixth, he had commanded to be; and therefore the Hebrew clause "and it was so" is really more appropriate at the end of the seventh, where it now stands, than at the end of the sixth,

where the Seventy put it. There can be little doubt that the position it occupies in the latter arose from the scribes, and their notions of uniformity. We therefore reject the emendation adopted by Geddes and Plüschke* on the authority of the Seventy.

In like manner, in the eighth verse, the same version supplies, καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν, because this statement occurs in the tenth and twelfth verses. Hence some critics, such as Boothroyd and Plüschke, think that the clause was originally in the Hebrew, having been preserved by the Septuagint alone.† Or, Kennicott is ready with two other emendations‡ which he prefers even to the Greek, viz. either that the words "and God saw that it was good," now in the tenth verse, should be transposed to the eighth, before "and the evening and the morning were the second day;" or, that the words, "and the evening and the morning were the second day," in the eighth verse, should be inserted in the tenth, after "and God saw that it was good." It is a pity that the text were not left undisturbed; for such interference with it is out of place on the present occasion, as Toepler justly observes.§

In pursuance of the same system, the Septuagint repeats the words καὶ συνήχθη τὸ ὕδωρ, κ. τ. λ. in the ninth verse. "We naturally expect after 'And so it was' to find the event detailed," says Boothroyd. The "natural expectations" of modern writers should be sparingly and cautiously transferred to Moses. Here he would repudiate the amendment assigned to him.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth verses, the received text reads:—"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them

* Lectiones Alexandrinae et Hebraicae, p. 11.

† Biblia Hebraica, &c. by B. Boothroyd.

‡ Dissertat. Generalis, ed. Bruns, pp. 174, 175.

§ De Pentateuchi interpretat. Alexand. indole critica et hermen. p. 11.

be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years: And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so."

Here the Samaritan, Septuagint, one MS. of Kennicott and one of De Rossi, insert in the fourteenth verse the words "to give light upon the earth." Hence the verse would read, "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth, and to divide the day from the night," &c. The supplied clause is obviously borrowed from the next verse; and the repetition of it appears anything but natural. "The chief design of the heavenly luminaries," says Boothroyd, "establishes the Samaritan reading." But does not the Samaritan reading make the design of the heavenly luminaries to be stated twice in succession? Is not this a redundancy which it inserts in the text?

Officious critics think that they can improve even upon the Samaritan in this place. "There is a manifest redundancy," says Geddes, "in these two verses; and I have some suspicion that verse fifteen is an interpolation."* This is bold enough. Akin to it is the conjecture of Boothroyd:—"Some scribe having omitted the words (supplied by the Samaritan) in their proper place, afterwards inserted them; and hence originated the fifteenth verse."† This is worse than trifling. It is idle and mischievous tampering with the text, in the absence of authority and reason. Is there any good ground for suspecting the integrity of the Masoretic text in this place? We can see none, except a peculiarity of construction which appears thus in English, "let there be lights in the firmament of heaven, —— and let them be for lights in the firmament of heaven," &c. Here there is no tautology. It is said first, "let luminaries be" or exist; and secondly, "let them be for luminaries in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth," designating

* Critical remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures, p. 18.

† Biblia Hebraica, ad vers.

the purposes for which they were made. This is quite natural. The writer speaks first of *making* the luminaries; and then of *the disposing* of them so as to fulfil the purposes for which they were made. It is true that in the fourteenth verse the object for which the luminaries were made is stated immediately after God said "let there be lights;" but the fifteenth verse, in returning to the purpose they were made for, illustrates the words of the fourteenth.

In the twentieth verse the Septuagint supplies, as it did at the sixth, *καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.* The reason of the insertion is apparent; but it must be rejected as before from the Hebrew text.

At the 26th verse the Syriac version alone inserts "*beast of*" after "every," as if the Hebrew were וּבְכָל חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ. Hence Dimock and others suppose that the supplied substantive was early dropped. This is wholly unwarranted.

In the 28th verse, the Septuagint adds after "and over the fowl of the air," *and over all cattle and all the earth;* but the Syriac has merely "and over the cattle," and *does* not therefore agree with the Septuagint, as has been said. Hence some think that the supplied words originally belonged to the Hebrew. "The addition," says Boothroyd, "is conformable to the Hebrew idiom, and particularly to the order observed throughout the whole chapter." Yes; but it is obviously taken from the twenty-sixth verse.*

Genesis ii.

Gen. ii. 2. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made."

Here instead of the *seventh* day, the Samaritan, Septuagint, Syriac, and Josephus, read *sixth* day: "And on the *sixth* day God ended his work," &c. &c. The reason of this alteration is manifest, lest the text should appear to say that God cre-

* See Lee, Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia minora, p. 10.

ated anything on the seventh day. On the ground of an imaginary difficulty these versions proposed at once to change the word. And it is strange that Houbigant, Cappell, and Illgen should have followed them; with Kennicott and Boothroyd of course. The alteration should not have been proposed. It savours of the Samaritan and Septuagint scribes. To remove all appearance of inconsistency between the present Masoretic reading and the narrative, Glassius, Michaelis, Drusius, Pilkington, and others render the verb in the pluperfect, "*had ended* on the seventh day." Geddes* however objects that it does not remove the difficulty, which arises, as he thinks from the preposition ב, not from the verb. The sense is frigid, if the proposed rendering be adopted. "After God had ended his work on the seventh day, he rested on the seventh day from all his work." The true sense of the verb with which the adjective is connected is, *put an end to* his work the seventh day. The following words sufficiently shew that the work did not *extend into* the seventh day; which it *might* do, as far as the terms before us are concerned. The clause may or may not imply that something was created on the seventh day.

Apart from the slight external evidence in favour of the new reading, internal evidence is against it; for the writer had ceased to speak of the sixth day at the end of the preceding chapter; and the parallelism will not admit of the renewed mention of that day in the present verse.†

Gen. ii. 24. Here some authorities read, instead of "they shall become one flesh," "they *two* shall become one flesh," or, "of the two of them shall be one flesh." The difference of reading lies in inserting the adjective *two* with a pronominal suffix or pronoun.

* Critical remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures, p. 23.

† See Gesenius, De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, &c. pp. 50, 51.

No Hebrew MS. yet collated has the word *two*. It is found however in the Samaritan, the reading of which is משניהם, in the Septuagint, the Syriac, Jerome in the Latin version or Vulgate, the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, in the New Testament (Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 6; 1 Cor. vi. 16; Ephesians v. 31). Philo, and Jerome in his commentary on the Ephesians, also have it.

In consequence of these witnesses, many critics have little hesitation in admitting the Samaritan reading as authentic. Houbigant, Michaelis, Starck, Kennicott, and others receive it. But there is room for doubt; and accordingly Fabricy, Simon, and most critics are adverse to its reception. It is much against it that no Hebrew MS. whatever exhibits it. And then the versions in its favour resolve themselves into two authorities, viz. the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint translation. There is at least ground for supposing that the Syriac and Pseudo-Jonathan have not been free from the influence of the Septuagint upon them. The reading is very like a Samaritan one in its character, which adds for the sake of perspicuity, or supplies an apparent deficiency. It is like Samaritan and Septuagint paraphrase. And we are inclined to look upon it in that light. What confirms us in this view is the verb וְהָיוּ before the word supplied, which is altered in the Samaritan copy into וְהָיָה. Indeed this change was required. And yet וְהָיוּ is found in all Hebrew MSS. *

It is no good objection that the New Testament agrees with the Samaritan and Septuagint. It is well known that the writers of it generally quoted from the Seventy. They followed those ancient translators in places where there is a wide difference between the Greek and the original. If the Greek gave the *sense* of the Hebrew, they deemed it sufficient for their purpose. In their view, the *ipsissima verba* were not

* Lee, Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta, &c. p. 11.

essential or necessary.* On the whole, we believe that the Masoretic reading should not be disturbed in this place, though such critics as Boothroyd think it *evidently* wrong.

Zechariah xii. 10.

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born."

Here the received text has אֵלַי *upon me.* Another reading is אֵלָיו *upon him*, instead of *upon me.* Let us look at the external evidence in favour of אֵלָיו. In the first place, thirty-eight MSS. have it. Eight have it *a prima manu*, twelve now, five perhaps, four in the margin. One MS. of De Rossi remarks that אֵלָיו is read in others, and eighteen have it as a marginal *K'ri.* It is written אֵלָו defectively in one MS.

Raymund Martini testifies that there were many MSS. in the thirteenth century which had this reading; and therefore he accuses the Jews of changing it. Peter Niger, as quoted by Wolf brings the same accusation against them.

The Soncino edition of the prophets, 1486, has this reading. Various Jewish writers give it, the Talmudists in the Treatise *Succa*, Saadias, Rabbi Parchon. In their commentaries it is followed by Rabbi Joseph Kara, Rabbi Isaias, Rabbi Abenezra, Jarchi, Kimchi in the older editions of his commentary and others. A note in the margin of 296 Kennicott says that it is the reading of the oriental Jews.

The Apostle John is also quoted for it. Citing the pas-

* "Nemo in crisi Novi Testamenti exercitatus, id pro rato sumeret aut Dominum nostrum, aut Apostolos ejus, de verbis vel etiam locutionibus curiosius egisse." Ibid.

sage he has ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν in his Gospel xix. 37; and in the Apocalypse (i. 7) αὐτόν.

Many of the fathers both Greek and Latin have the same reading, as Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Cyril, Barnabas, Hippolytus. Jerome states that John takes this testimony of Zechariah *juxta Hebraicam veritatem*, shewing that such was the Hebrew reading in his day. The Greek scholiast on the codex Barberini says the same of the apostle.

The context is also adduced for this reading, in which the *third* person is used, not the *first*. "The context," says Dr. H. Owen, "manifestly *requires* that it should be אֵלַי."*

Influenced by these testimonies, many critics prefer the present reading to the textual one. Whiston, Kennicott, Starck, Bohn, Tychsen, Dr. H. Owen, and many others adopt it; Bohn and Tychsen not *decidedly*.

On the other hand, the majority of MSS. and the better ones too, have the Masoretic reading. In like manner, all the ancient versions contain it. The Septuagint in all its varieties has it. It is in the Syriac, the Chaldee, the Vulgate, the Arabic, Theodotion. It is most probable that Aquila and Symmachus also had it. Thus the weight of ancient translations is manifestly on the side of אֵלַי.

The authority of the fathers is of no force, because they took the passage from John, rather than from Zechariah.

With regard to the apostle himself, it is by no means clear that he read אֵלָיו rather than אֵלַי. His quotation is inexact; and the word before us seems to have been omitted by him. It is certain that his words will agree with אֵלַי as well as with אֵלָיו. It is therefore irrelevant to adduce him as a witness on either side.

One thing is certain, that אֵלַי is the more difficult reading, and was more likely to give rise to the other than the contrary.

* The modes of quotation used by the evangelical writers explained and vindicated, p. 66.

It was the endeavour to get rid of the difficulty caused by אֵלַי which appears to have occasioned variations in the text.

As to those who attribute the reading אֵלָיו to the malice of the Jews, lest the textual one should prove the incarnation and divinity of Messiah against them, they have no ground for the charge. Have not the Jews preserved אֵלַי, the very reading which is said to be most adverse to them? How is it that the far greater number of copies and the better ones, have the present Masoretic reading? How is it that some of the keenest Jewish writers against Christianity, such as Lipmann, Rabbi Isaac, Abarbanel, and other Jewish doctors read אֵלַי, without mentioning any other form of the word. Norzius also confesses, that אֵלָיו is not the reading of the sacred text. The real state of the case probably was, that the marginal reading was introduced by scribes, in consequence of the context. They wished to make the context uniform, by having the third person throughout. It was unskilfulness not ignorance that led to it. Thus we agree with such critics as Carpzov, Dathe, De Rossi, Hitzig, and many more, who abide by the Masoretic text. For other remarks on the identity of meaning between the first person in Zechariah and the third in John's gospel, we must refer the reader to another work.*

Genesis iv. 8.

Here the sense seems to be imperfect: "And Cain said to Abel his brother . . . . . and it came to pass, when they were in the field," &c. In the English version it stands, "And Cain *talked with* Abel his brother," &c.; but it is doubtful whether the verb bears this sense; or, if it *does* bear it, it is unnatural to have recourse to it in this place. Three other explanations of it that have been proposed are objectionable. "Cain said to Abel his brother," is a simple and obvious meaning of the clause. The apparent chasm is filled

* Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 378.

up by the Samaritan copy, which reads נֵלְכָה הַשָּׂדֶה, *let us go into the field.* With it agree the Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate and both the Chaldee paraphrases.

No MS. hitherto collated has the supplied words. All read as the present Masoretic text does. They may have been conformed to it, if they were once different. And some of the Jews themselves acknowledge a chasm, and insert the words. "There are, says Rabbi Immanuel, who say that Cain said to Abel, *let us go out into the field.*" Besides there are MSS. which have here a *piska* or vacant space, smaller or greater where words should come in. Kennicott enumerates twenty-two and De Rossi five in which the space left is larger than that in Van der Hooght's edition, where only one letter and the *soph-pasuk* could be put. Forty-eight editions are also given by De Rossi having a like space, including the sixteen successive editions of the Venice Bible, but not that of Van der Hooght. On the other hand, by far the majority of MSS. have no vacant space. A hundred and eighty-one of Kennicott, and seventy-one of De Rossi, besides forty-five printed editions want it. The learned Jewish critics Lonzanus and Norzi condemn it as a mere mistake of copyists; the latter observing that in the more accurate copies and in the synagogue rolls there was no such space. Rabbi Menachem de Lonzano says that there should be no *piska*, for that there was none in the codex Hillel; and that Maimonides made no commencement of a section at the place.

In like manner Symmachus, Theodotion, Onkelos, the two Arabic versions omit the words given by the Samaritan; and Jerome too condemns them.

The Masorah has been referred to in this instance. Thus the little Masorah (not the great Masorah, as Kennicott affirms) says on the verse כ״ח פְּסוּקִין בְּמִצְעוּת פָּסוּק, *i.e. there are twenty-eight verses ending in the middle of a verse*, viz. as to the sense. Many printed editions that have not a vacant space put in the

margin בְּלֹא פִּסְקָא, *without piska*, ex. gr. those of Jablonski and Michaelis do this. But such is not *the Masorah*, as the note in Doederlein's edition of the Hebrew Bible and the words of Carpzov himself* might lead one to suppose. It is not the proper Masoretic note. It was put by such scribes as followed copies without *the piska*, and by editors who approved of that reading and gave it.

What then is meant by the Masoretic note to this verse? Does it signify that the text is defective—that something was early omitted from it? Kennicott's reasoning appears to proceed on the affirmative reply to this question. But we doubt the probability of it. What the Masoretes seem to have meant is, that the sense is elliptical—that something must be supplied to complete the meaning. That they intended to convey the idea that a word or words had been lost from the original Hebrew text, is not probable. It was only *the sense* that was to be supplied; but not *words that were in the text at first.*

In this case we are inclined to adopt the reading of the Samaritan copy. The context requires something to complete it, and with authorities so ancient we fill it up in the manner directed. The integrity of the Hebrew text is of course defended here as elsewhere by many; but we agree with those who prefer the Samaritan reading.

Joshua xxi. 35.

After the 35th verse of Joshua, chapter xxi. the text often has the two following verses:—

וּמִמַּטֵּה רְאוּבֵן אֶת בֶּצֶר וְאֶת מִגְרָשָׁהָ
וְאֶת יַהְצָה וְאֶת מִגְרָשָׁהָ׃
אֶת קְדֵמוֹת וְאֶת מִגְרָשָׁהָ אֶת מֵיפָעַת
וְאֶת מִגְרָשָׁהָ עָרִים אַרְבַּע׃

* "Contra vero ad Gen. iv. 8, Masora in Bibliis Halensibus notat: בלא פסקא hunc versum *absque piska*, seu spacio linea relicto, esse scribendum," &c.—Crit. Sac. Vet. Test. p. 304.

"And out of the tribe of Reuben, Bezer with her suburbs, and Jahazah with her suburbs; Kedemoth with her suburbs, Mephaath with her suburbs; four cities."

I. The verses as now given are supported by many authorities.

1. Ninety-two MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi have them. A few of these however have them *a prima manu*, or *now* only not at first; or in the margin.

2. They are in sixty-six printed editions enumerated by De Rossi.

3. They are in the Syriac, Chaldee and Arabic versions.

4. A few MSS. in the time of Kimchi which he quotes on Joshua xxi. 7, had them.

But this summary gives an imperfect notion of the amount of external evidence in favour of the verses, because there are differences in the form in which they appear in the copies; so that it is necessary, for the sake of accuracy, to separate the testimonies which witness for the various forms presented by the verses.

II. The verses are also read thus:—וּמִמַּטֵּה רְאוּבֵן אֶת עִיר מִקְלָט הָרֹצֵחַ אֶת בֶּצֶר with the rest as before, meaning "And out of the tribe of Reuben to be a city of refuge for the manslayer, Bezer with her suburbs," &c. In favour of this reading there are sixteen MSS., one of which is *a prima manu*, eight printed copies, a Targum in one of De Rossi's MSS. Four Venice editions of the Bible have marginal notes to the effect that the verses should be thus written, as they are found in the most correct Spanish MSS.

"That the words *to be a city of refuge for the slayer* are genuine, is strongly presumeable from the Greek version, which has here *τὴν πόλιν τὸ φευγαδευτήριον τοῦ φονεύσαντος*. But it is made certain by the 7th and 8th verses of the preceding

chapter, which tell us there were six cities of refuge, three on each side of Jordan, of which *Bezer* was one; and yet, though the other five cities are mentioned in this chapter as *cities of refuge*, Bezer is not mentioned as such," &c. This is the view of Kennicott.*

III. Sometimes the thirty-sixth verse reads thus:

וּמִמַּטֵּה רְאוּבֵן אֶת בֶּצֶר בְּמִדְבָּר וְאֶת מִגְרָשֶׁהָ

i.e. "And out of the tribe of Reuben, Bezer in the desert, with her suburbs," &c.; the rest being the same.

Twenty-three MSS. have this addition, several of them however only in the margin, others as corrected; and one of them הַמִּדְבָּר.

IV. At other times, the two latter readings are put together thus—

וּמִמַּטֵּה רְאוּבֵן אֶת עִיר מִקְלַט הָרֹצֵחַ אֶת בֶּצֶר בַּמִּדְבַּר וְאֶת מִגְרָשֶׁהָ:

"And out of the tribe of Reuben, to be a city of refuge for the manslayer, Bezer in the desert, with her suburbs;" the rest as before.

Thirty-five MSS. have this reading, several of them having the disputed words supplied or in the margin. Five printed editions exhibit it. The Septuagint, the Vulgate, and a Targum on the prophets favour it. Norzi says that the verses were found thus in old Spanish MSS.; but the result of De Rossi's collations does not confirm the statement. It should also be noticed that three of the most important editions which have the verses in this form inclose them in brackets. The Vulgate omits the word *manslayer*, and adds *Misor* after *Bezer in the desert.* Some MSS. of it omit *Misor*, some, *ultra Jordanem contra Jericho*, which clause is wanting in the Hebrew, and is apparently borrowed from the parallel in 1 Chron. vi.

* The state of the printed Hebrew text, pp. 442, 443.

There are other minor varieties of reading in the verses on which it is useless to dwell, such as, for וְאֶת יַהְצָה, simply אֶת יַהְצָה without the copulative; for אֶת קְדֵמוֹת, וְאֶת קְדֵמוֹת with the copulative; for אֶת מֵיפָעַת, וְאֶת מֵיפָעַת with the copulative. The respective authorities in favour of each of these three are drawn out in De Rossi's work with great accuracy and fulness. But the variations are so trifling, that we need not do more than mention them.

Let us now look at the weight of authority in favour of the two verses in one form or other.

1. The greater number of MSS. contain them. One hundred and sixty-four collated by Kennicott and De Rossi have them; while from seventy they are absent. Nor are those that have them inferior copies. They are of the best quality, and many of them Spanish. And they are found in several of great antiquity.

2. Most editions have them. Of twenty-six editions collated by Kennicott twenty-three have the verses, three wanting them. And seventy-nine editions examined by De Rossi have them. Among these editions are all of the fifteenth century prepared in Italy or Spain, all indeed before the Rabbinical Bible of Bomberg in 1525, where they were expunged by Rabbi Jacob Ben Chayim. These editions include such as were taken from the more accurate and better MSS., from Spanish and even from Masoretic exemplars. Thus an ancient edition of the Bible without place or date which De Rossi describes as superior in correctness to the Soncino edition of 1488, and as probably about the same age; the Pisaurian Bible, the Complutensian Polyglott, the Leirian, Pisaurian, and Thessalonian editions of the prophets contain the verses. Even after Ben Chayim had expelled them from the text, they were retained in many excellent editions as those of Robert Stephens at Paris, the Plantin editions, the Polyglotts, many of the Venetian editions, those superintended by Manasseh Ben Israel and

Rabbi David Nunnes Torres at Amsterdam, and the important critical apparatus of Norzi.

3. All the ancient versions have them—the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Chaldee, the Vulgate, Arabic, Ethiopic, and some MSS. of the Chaldee paraphrase. The variety of reading which appears in the Septuagint shews, that they were not taken from the parallel passage in Chronicles and inserted in Joshua; but that the translators followed Hebrew MSS. in both places. The same is the case with the Syriac version, whose rendering of the verses differs in Joshua and Chronicles.

4. The parallel passage in 1 Chron. vi. 63, 64 has them. It is true that their existence here has been urged as a reason why they should not be in Joshua; yet there are reasons against their having been transferred from the later to the earlier book. One of the most obvious is, that the same words are not in Joshua as in Chronicles. There are as many variations as shew an independent origin.

5. The context is in favour of their authenticity. In the seventh verse it is stated that the Merarites had certain cities out of the tribe of Reuben, and out of the tribe of Gad, and out of the tribe of Zebulon, twelve cities in all. In the fortieth verse the same number is repeated. But unless these two verses be in the text, the number twelve is wrong. With the omission of them, the number of cities is but eight. With them, the whole number twelve is made up. So too the number forty-eight in the forty-first verse is wrong, without the verses before us. It is only forty-four without them.

6. It is more likely that the verses were omitted in a few MSS. than that they were inserted in the great majority of them. The former proceeding is easier and more frequent than the latter. Besides, the cause of their omission here may be discovered. The thirty-fifth verse ends with the same words עָרִים אַרְבַּע as the thirty-seventh; and the thirty-sixth begins with the same word as the thirty-eighth וּמִמַּטֵּה. Thus

ὁμοιοτέλευτον would readily lead a scribe to omit the two verses.

These considerations are sufficient to shew that the verses are a constituent part of the text, and were omitted at first by mistake. They formed an integral portion of the chapter of Joshua, in which many editions present them.

The chief reasons against their authenticity may be readily disposed of.

The authority of the Masorah is against them. According to the final Masorah, the number of verses in the book of Joshua is 656. But if the two verses in question belong to the text, the number will be 658. And the Masoretes always numbered the verses of the books in the Bible accurately.

The argument derived from the Masorah would be of more weight, if the work so called were complete and perfect. But the Jews themselves acknowledge that it is mutilated and incomplete; and that it varies in different MSS. In the counting of verses in a book, MSS. differ with one another. As an example of this, De Rossi states that one of his copies enumerated 610 verses in Joshua; another and a very accurate Spanish one 566; two other Spanish ones 650 and 756 respectively.

Besides, when so many Masoretic codices are opposed to the Masorah in this case, its authority is worth nothing.

The testimony of Rabbi Hai a Jewish critic of the tenth century is adduced against the verses. His words are, when he was asked respecting these very cities, "though they be not reckoned in this place, they are reckoned in the Chronicles," or, as they may also be rendered, "if they are not reckoned in this place (Joshua), yet they are reckoned in the Chronicles." It will be observed, that this testimony is by no means a clear one. It does not plainly say that the verses belong to Chronicles. It settles nothing. "*If* or *though* the verses be not reckoned," &c. The reply is conditional, and proves no more than that some copies had the verses, others not, at that

time. Kimchi himself saw that the words of the Rabbi were not decisive; and therefore he writes hesitatingly "*it seems* from his [Rabbi Hai's] answer, that the verses were not written in their copies."

The next witness quoted against the verses is Kimchi, who says, he never found these verses in any ancient corrected MS. This testimony is ambiguous. It may either mean that the MSS. had them written *a prima manu* and erased; or that they had them affixed to the margin by a later hand. Kennicott understands it in the former sense, and also several MSS. of Kimchi's commentary in the possession of De Rossi. It would have been surprising, says Kennicott, if he had found them in any ancient MS. corrected by the Masoretic standard, since the Masorah does not acknowledge them. But whatever may have been Kimchi's judgment about correct or corrected MSS., the Jews do not implicitly follow him in his opinion about the verses. Thus the editors of the Venice Bibles of 1678, 1730, 1739 remark, that *what Kimchi writes* (on the point) *is not a sufficient proof.*

Believing that the proof in favour of these verses is sufficient, we cannot but blame Ben Chayim in expunging them from the text. Doubtless he was induced to do so by the authority of Kimchi; for he cites him as well as the Masorah. It was the more recent Masorah here which Kimchi adopted. After Ben Chayim had rejected them, other editors followed, such as Buxtorf, Moses Ben Simeon of Frankfort, Jablonski, Van der Hooght, &c.

Before leaving the passage, we should state that it is doubtful whether the Vulgate version here was taken from the Hebrew. Jerome appears in this place to have taken the passage from the Septuagint. Let the reader compare the texts of both and see whether this suspicion be not well founded. The Latin, after naming five cities, adds at the end, *four cities*, just as the Greek does. This is confirmed by the circumstance

that the verses were wanting in Jerome's Hebrew copies, *as the Benedictine editors themselves* think.*

Lamentations ii. 16, 17; iii. 46, 47, 48; iv. 16, 17.

Every chapter in the book of Lamentations is an acrostic except the last. In the first two chapters, every verse begins with a letter of the alphabet, taking them in the common order. Hence these chapters contain twenty-two verses each. In the third chapter, three successive verses begin with the same letter, and go over the entire alphabet; so that the chapter contains sixty-six verses. The fourth chapter is arranged like the first and second. But there is a departure from the usual order of the Hebrew letters in the case of פ and ע; for פ precedes ע in chapters ii. 16, 17; iii. 46, 47, 48; iv. 16, 17. Hence several critics think, that the right order has been disturbed—that by some mistake in early times the verses beginning with פ and ע have been made to change places. This proceeds on the assumption that the order of letters in the alphabet, when the Lamentations were written, was the same as now. And that the original author adhered to alphabetical arrangement throughout. The former is quite probable; but the latter may be doubted.

Very few MSS. transpose the verses so as to have ע before פ. The Syriac version in each of the three cases changes the order. The Septuagint retains the order of verses in the Masoretic text, but transposes the letters at the beginning. Remembering that in the alphabetical Psalms the acrostic arrangement is never strictly followed, it is most probable that Jeremiah has departed from the usual order as far as two letters are concerned, in the second, third, and fourth chapters; while he has retained it in the first chapter. Like other sacred writers, the prophet does not put himself under constant re-

* Comp. De Rossi, Variae lectiones Vet. Test. vol. ii. pp. 96-106; Appendix, p. 227; Scholia Critica, p. 36.

straint. He will not bind himself to any one external form of composition, or preserve an undeviating technicality. Meddling critics have conjectured here, as in other cases, that some error has occurred—either that ע and פ should be transposed in the first chapter, or in the next three; but they forget that the writers of the Bible were less artificial than modern ideas would represent them to be. Gesenius has touched the true cause when he speaks of deviations like the present, as "*Nachlässigkeiten* des Dichters,"* though he might have employed a better term.

2 *Samuel* xv. 7.

"And it came to pass after forty years, that Absalom said unto the Greek, I pray thee let me go and pay my vow," &c. &c.

Here two MSS. of Kennicott read אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם, *forty days*, instead of *forty years*, as in the Masoretic text. This reading is adopted by Hitzig and Maurer.

Another reading is *four* years instead of *forty*, viz. אַרְבַּע instead of the plural אַרְבָּעִים. This is found in the Syriac, Arabic, Vulgate (the Sixtine edition). Theodoret, Cappell, Grotius, Houbigant, Michaelis, Kennicott, Thenius, and others adopt it. It is remarkable, however, that it is in none of Kennicott's or De Rossi's MSS. Josephus has *two* years.

But is the textual reading, for departing from which there is so little authority, erroneous? Many declare it to be so. "And it came to pass after forty years." The *terminus a quo* is not given. It may be from the reign of Saul, as the margin of one of De Rossi's copies has it. It may be from David's anointing. It may be from the commencement of David's reign; but that is less probable, because the occurrence before us would then be placed in the last years of David. We do not think that it means the fortieth year of Absalom; *when he was forty years old;* as in this case there would be some addi-

* Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache und Schrift, p. 166.

tion to the words. It is likely that *four* is the right reading. Since the external evidence is so overwhelmingly against any change in the text, we should abide by the words as they stand, were there not a necessity in the context for departing from them. It is objected however that those who alter the plural into the singular, and out of *forty* make *four*, violate a rule in Hebrew syntax, according to which the nouns numbered by the units, from two to ten inclusive, are commonly placed in the plural. Very few exceptions occur. But this objection is obviated by the very probable use of numeral letters ד = 4 was changed for מ = 40. These very letters were elsewhere confounded.*

Proverbs xviii. 22.

"Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing; and obtaineth favour from the Lord." Here the Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, Arabic, the Targum in a MS. at Cambridge, and another at Berlin, the Targum in a MS. of De Rossi, the Targum in six of Kennicott's MSS. collated by Bruns, and the Chaldee of a MS. (58) in the royal library at Paris, read "a good wife," as if the adjective טוֹבָה were with the substantive. One Hebrew MS. of Kennicott has three or four letters erased after the noun *wife*.

On the strength of these authorities, which are very weak compared with all other external testimony, and from considerations founded on the text as it now is, Houbigant, Kennicott, and Boothroyd, scruple not to amend the text by inserting *good*. Kennicott's manner of arriving at the new reading is amusing if not curious. "Can it be truly said that every wife is a blessing? Could an universal maxim of this nature proceed from the wisest of men? Could such a proverb possibly be delivered by him who represents the evil and the foolish woman as a curse—by him who says, that *the conten-*

* See Reinke, Beitraege, u. s. w. pp. 144, 145.

tions of a wife are a continual dropping; and *she that maketh ashamed is as rottenness in her husband's bones;* who (to enforce it with particular emphasis) assures us in two separate proverbs, that it *is better to dwell in the wilderness, than with a contentious and angry woman?*" By virtue of these and similar considerations, does the critic arrive at the inference. "'Tis presumed therefore, that Solomon in the text before us expressed himself thus, *He that findeth a* GOOD *wife findeth a good thing,*"* &c.

We are not influenced by such considerations to think that the adjective *good* was part of the original Hebrew text. The proposed emendation presents itself in the light of an attempt to deteriorate the text. It makes the writer propound a trifling, tautological statement. If he says, *whoso findeth a good wife, findeth a good thing*, he utters a puerile saying which every one knows. These maxims of Solomon, proposed as they are in general terms, admit of exceptions and qualifications. They may not be *absolutely* or *universally* true. They hold good in most cases.

Isaiah lviii. 10.

"If thou *draw out thy soul* to the hungry." Lowth remarks, that this is an obscure phrase and without example in any other place. Instead of נַפְשֶׁךָ, *thy soul*, eight MSS. of Kennicott and three of De Rossi, two of them *a prima manu*, read לַחְמְךָ, *thy bread.* The Syriac and Arabic have the same reading. The Septuagint, according to Lowth, combines both readings. Hence Lowth and others alter the text and translate, "if thou bring forth thy bread to the hungry."

Emendation like this is uncalled for and arbitrary. The text is right as it stands. The meaning is, "if thou wilt reach forth to the hungry thy desire," *i. e.* the object of thy desire or appetite, viz. *thy morsel.*

* Second Dissertation on the state of the printed Hebrew text, p. 189, et seq.

Exodus xx. 2-17. *Deuteronomy* v. 6-21.

In these two paragraphs, the Decalogue is given. The first relates to the time when it was originally promulgated from Sinai; the latter to the time when Moses rehearsed to the people the story of what happened to them on their way to Canaan, nearly forty years after. On comparing the words of the law given in Exodus and Deuteronomy a few slight differences are observable, which, though small in appearance, are great in importance. Let us see what they are according to the Masoretic text.

Exodus xx. 2-17.

2. I *am* the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

3. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

4. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness *of any thing* that *is* in heaven above, or that *is* in the earth beneath, or that *is* in the water under the earth :

5. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them : for I the LORD thy God *am* a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me ;

6. And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

7. Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain ; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

8. Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.

Deuteronomy v. 6-21.

6. I *am* the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage.

7. Thou shalt have none other gods before me.

8. Thou shalt not make thee *any* graven image, *or* any likeness *of any thing* that *is* in heaven above, or that *is* in the earth beneath, or that *is* in the waters beneath the earth :

9. Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them : for I the LORD thy God *am* a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me,

10. And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.

11. Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain : for the LORD will not hold *him* guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

12. Keep the sabbath day to sanctify it, as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee.

Exodus xx.	*Deuteronomy* v.
9. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work :	13. Six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work :
10. But the seventh day *is* the sabbath of the Lord thy God : *in it* thou shall not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that *is* within thy gates :	14. But the seventh day *is* the sabbath of the LORD thy God : *in it* thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidser vant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stran ger that *is* within thy gates ; that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou.
11. For *in* six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them *is*, and rested the seventh day : wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.	15. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and *that* the LORD thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm : therefore the LORD thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day.
12. Honour thy father and thy mother : that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.	16. Honour thy father and thy mother, as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee ; that thy days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee, in the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.
13. Thou shalt not kill.	17. Thou shalt not kill.
14. Thou shalt not commit adultery.	18. Neither shalt thou commit adultery.
15. Thou shalt not steal.	19. Neither shalt thou steal.
16. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.	20. Neither shalt thou bear false witness against thy neighbour.
17. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant. nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that *is* thy neighbour's.	21. Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house, his field, or his manservant, or his maidservant, his ox, or his ass, or any *thing* that *is* thy neighbour's.

Such are the differences between the law as recorded in the two books of Exodus and Deuteronomy. The question arises, how can they be explained and accounted for.

Is it necessary or probable that the words of the Decalogue should be exactly the same in the two cases before us? Should

there be no variation whatever between them? Should they agree in all respects, down to the smallest particle, as well as to the order of succession in which they stand? So many think, influenced by such considerations as the following:—The narrative asserts that *the words* were *spoken* by God. They were *uttered by his mouth.* "And God *spake all these words*, saying" (Exod. xx. 1). "*These words* the Lord *spake* unto all your assembly," &c. (Deut. v. 22). Hence it has been inferred that the words of the entire Decalogue were articulately pronounced by the voice of God.

Again, not only were the words of the law articulately pronounced by the mouth of God, but they were also *written* or *graved* on two tables of stone by Himself. "And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables" (Exod. xxxii. 16). "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest." (Exod. xxxiv. 1.)

Still farther it is observable, that the words are for the most part the same in both places. They occur too in the same grammatical forms or inflections. They follow one another in the same order.

These considerations have led many to infer that the text in Exodus and Deuteronomy was originally the same—word for word and letter for letter. It was completely and absolutely identical.

It is manifest however that as the text now is, this presumed identity does not appear. There are differences between the words of the commandments as they are read in the Hebrew Scriptures. There is no such *perfect* agreement now. What then is to be said in relation to the variations in the text? Of course they are attributed to the accidents of time and transcription. But not *all* of them, for several of the most conspicuous are excepted, by the application of a certain principle.

The ten *commandments themselves*, are separated from what is regarded as *adventitious* to them. Reasons are annexed to them, the more to enforce them. Illustrative remarks of a parenthetic nature are associated with them. Explanatory clauses are put to make them clearer and more definite. Such adjuncts are divided off from the strictly *preceptive* parts. It is believed that *they* are not essential portions of the commandments themselves. They are *accessories to* rather than *essential constituents of* the Decalogue. Accordingly, by means of a separating line, the *purely preceptive* parts of the law are distinguished and placed apart, in order that their words as given in Exodus and Deuteronomy may be compared. But is not the separating line somewhat difficult to find? How can we thus divide the commandments of God from the commandments of the writer? What is the test? Where is the criterion to enable us to make this distinction between the words of God and of man? The reply is, that a very simple, safe, and easy criterion is at hand—one that cannot fail to guide the inquirer aright. God uttered the precepts in his own name; and therefore he speaks *in the first person*. Hence *the commandments proper* are all in the first person singular. But if any statements be appended to them, in which the Deity is *spoken of* and is not *the speaker*, they do not belong to the commandments. They are the historian's comments or explanations. They are reasons or considerations which he has annexed to enforce them. In the strictly preceptive parts—the naked Decalogue itself—Jehovah speaks; in the adjuncts where the third person occurs, the historian speaks. By the application of this test, certain portions are assigned directly to the Lord; others directly to the writer; or in other terms, the Decalogue is distinguished from the adventitious remarks accompanying it.

To this criterion we are disposed to demur. Is it a safe and simple one? Does the key fit the lock it is applied to? The answer must be in the negative. One fatal exception to

it presents itself immediately: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." This is the third commandment. And yet the "Lord thy God" are terms employed in it. Jehovah does not speak of himself in the first person; he is himself *spoken of* in the third. The test would make this a statement annexed by the historian, and no part of the original precept. But that were evidently erroneous. Thus the example is fatal to the proposed test. The criterion then is worthless. It must be discarded. Nor can the first person be put into this third commandment by any rational criticism. Here there is no various reading—no authority for imagining that the precept ever differed in the least from what it is now. And let not conjectural alchymy endeavour to change it; for it abhors every torturing application of that nature. Look at it as we will, it furnishes no room for conjecture.

But it is irrelevant to our present purpose, to trace with some critics, the remarks of the writer annexed to the precepts properly so called. They are by no means so clear or so easily separable, as has been supposed. Doubtless it appears otherwise to such critics as Boothroyd, who affirms in reference to the clause "as the Lord thy God commanded thee," appended to the fifth commandment, that "to consider it a part of the law is absurd;" but he has not ventured to apply the same remark to any other annexed clause. He would have found it more difficult to separate *the law* and the historian's *explanatory statements*, in the case of *other precepts*.

Admitting the fact of *explanatory clauses* along with the *precepts themselves*, let us now consider the probability of the text having been identically the same with regard to *the latter*. Considering the nature of the variations at present existing, and the testimony of MSS., versions, and other materials of correction, can the texts of both places be brought into perfect agreement? Some believe that they can be so harmonised; or that it is the duty of the critic to shew how the thing may

and ought to be done. But all attempts of the kind have failed. And all such attempts *will* fail; because they are made in the face of facts and phenomena plainly adverse. They cannot succeed, because it is impossible. The Septuagint translator (or translators) has endeavoured to do something towards it by supplementing the text in one place, from the text in the other. In like manner the Samaritan Pentateuch has a mutual supplementing. But this is a characteristic feature in both documents. They have made use of parallels to a large extent for the purpose of bringing passages into a state of uniformity, or of explaining what is less obvious in the one, by an elucidatory clause or clauses from the other.

The following are the differences in *the Decalogue strictly so called*, which must be disposed of, for the purpose of shewing that the text in Exodus and Deuteronomy was originally the same.

Exodus xx.	*Deuteronomy* v.
No. 1. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness," &c. פֶּסֶל וְכָל תְּמוּנָה	No. 1. "Thou shalt not make thee any graven image (*or*) any likeness," &c. פֶּסֶל כָּל תְּמוּנָה
2. "Unto the third and fourth generation," &c. עַל שִׁלֵּשִׁים	2. "*And* unto the third and fourth generation," &c. וְעַל שִׁלֵּשִׁים
3. "*Remember* the sabbath-day," &c. זכוֹר	3. "*Keep* the sabbath-day," &c. שׁמוֹר
4. "Thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." עַבְדְּךָ וַאֲמָתְךָ וּבְהֶמְתֶּךָ וְגֵרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׁעָרֶיךָ	4. "*Nor* thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." וְעַבְדְּךָ וַאֲמָתְךָ וְשׁוֹרְךָ וַחֲמֹרְךָ וְכָל בְּהֶמְתֶּךָ וְגֵרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׁעָרֶיךָ

Exodus xx.	*Deuteronomy* v.
No. 5. "Thou shalt not commit adultery." לֹא תִּנְאָף	No. 5. "*And* thou shalt not commit adultery." וְלֹא תִּנְאָף
6. "Thou shalt not steal." לֹא תִּגְנֹב	6. "*And* thou shalt not steal." וְלֹא תִּגְנֹב
7. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." לֹא תַעֲנֶה בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁקֶר	7. "*And* thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." וְלֹא תַעֲנֶה בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁוְא
8. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's." לֹא תַחְמֹד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ לֹא תַחְמֹד אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ וְשׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ	8. "Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house, his field, or his manservant, or his maidservant, his ox, or his ass, or any thing that is thy neighbour's." וְלֹא תַחְמֹד אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְלֹא תִתְאַוֶּה בֵּית רֵעֶךָ שָׂדֵהוּ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ שׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ

From these parallels it will be seen that in *the precepts themselves* the two accounts vary both in respect to the words and their sequence. What is the correction furnished by the Samaritan copy?

In No. 1 the word כֹּל which is in Deuteronomy, is made וְכֹל agreeing with Exodus in sixty-four MSS., twenty-seven of which had it at first though it has been altered, one is doubtful, and two have it now though they had it not at first. It is also found in the Samaritan, Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic, in the Bodleian MSS. of the Chaldee paraphrase No. 5233 and No. 1262. It is wanting however in the Chaldee text of the Polyglott, though found in the Targum of seventeen

MSS. in the possession of De Rossi, and in the Targum of the Pentateuch of Sora published 1490. It is also in the Targum of Jonathan.

The authorities in question are numerous and weighty, but not sufficient of themselves to authorise the reception of וכל into the text of Deuteronomy.

No. 2. Here again the וְעַל of Deuteronomy is עַל, agreeing with Exodus, in sixty-three MSS., but nine of these have been altered in regard to it, and six have it now which did not originally exhibit it. It is also in the Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, and Chaldee versions, as also the Soncino edition of 1488. On the contrary, the עַל of Exodus is read וְעַל to agree with Deuteronomy in six MSS., three of them as at first written; in the Samaritan except seven MSS. of it, and the Arabic version.

No. 3. Here are two different Hebrew words. There is no various reading in either case, except in the Samaritan text, which reads שָׁמוֹר in Exodus as well as Deuteronomy. There is therefore every reason for believing that they are now as they were at first written.

No. 4. In this example, עַבְדְּךָ of Exodus is וְעַבְדְּךָ like the reading of Deuteronomy in fifty-five MSS., in twenty *a prima manu*, and one in the margin. The same reading is in the Syriac, Arabic, Targum of Jonathan, the Targum of Onkelos, in seventeen of De Rossi's MSS., and in several old editions of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It is also in an old edition of the fifteenth century without date or place, in the Soncino Bible in *the keeper* of the word at the end of the line.

On the other hand, one MS. of Kennicott, the Samaritan, and the Vulgate, have the reading of Deuteronomy עַבְדְּךָ without the connecting particle, like the text in Exodus.

The three words וְשׁוֹרְךָ וַחֲמֹרְךָ וְכֹל in Deuteronomy, not in Exodus, are not inserted in Exodus in any ancient authority.

Neither are they omitted in Deuteronomy by any ancient document.

Nos. 5 and 6. Here the reading of Deuteronomy וְלֹא תִנְאָף appears as לֹא תִנְאָף the reading of Exodus, in eight MSS., four *a prima manu*, the Samaritan, the Septuagint, Syriac, the Targum in three MSS. belonging to De Rossi, and one in the Bodleian 5233. In like manner וְלֹא תִגְנֹב of Deuteronomy appears as לֹא תִגְנֹב agreeing with Exodus in six MSS., the Samaritan, the Septuagint, Syriac, and the Targum in two MSS. of De Rossi.

With regard to the order of the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments, it is the same in Exodus and Deuteronomy in the Hebrew as well as the Samaritan. But the Septuagint version departs from the Hebrew order in Exodus. The Hebrew seventh is there the sixth; the Hebrew eighth is there the seventh; and the Hebrew sixth is there the eighth. This is countenanced by Philo. But in Deuteronomy the Greek and Hebrew order is the same.

No. 7. Here the reading of Exodus, לֹא תַעֲנֶה, for which Deuteronomy has וְלֹא תַעֲנֶה, appears also in the latter in six MSS. three of them *a prima manu*, the Samaritan, Septuagint, Syriac, and the Targum in two of De Rossi's MSS. The שָׁוְא of Deuteronomy is also שָׁקֶר corresponding with the Exodus reading in nine MSS., in eight *a prima manu*, and perhaps nine others. Several of these last nine have letters erased, but so as to shew that the original reading was probably שָׁקֶר.

No. 8. Here לֹא תַחְמֹד now in Exodus occurs as וְלֹא תַחְמֹד, agreeing with the Deuteronomy reading in twelve MSS., in the Samaritan, Vulgate, the Targum in eight copies.

On the other hand, וְלֹא תַחְמֹד in Deuteronomy is לֹא תַחְמֹד in eight MSS., three of them *a prima manu*, the Samaritan, Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, and the Targum in one copy (694). וְעַבְדוֹ in Exodus is simply עַבְדוֹ in seven MSS. the Sama-

ritan, the Persian version, and the Targum in one copy. Before the word וְעַבְדּוֹ is inserted the noun שָׂדֵהוּ *his field*, in three MSS., another perhaps, and another in the margin. It is also in the Samaritan and Septuagint. שׁוֹרוֹ in Deuteronomy is וְשׁוֹרוֹ as in Exodus, in thirty-eight MSS., nine of them *a prima manu*, in one now, in the Septuagint, Syriac, Arabic, the Targum in ten MSS., two *a prima manu*, and one as now altered, and in four ancient editions of the Pentateuch printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

There is no authority for supposing that the clause "neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house," is not authentic in Deuteronomy, or that it should also be in Exodus. The different arrangement of the clauses is likewise an *original* difference; in Exodus the house being *before* "the neighbour's wife;" in Deuteronomy *after* it.

The conclusion to be drawn from these varieties of reading is, that they arose from the correcting of the one text by the other. All have this *appearance*. And it is probable that all owe their origin to it. A few things are left untouched. In both places *they* are original words. In them the text do not harmonise, and were not tampered with for a purpose.

On the ground of external evidence alone, we reject all the various readings as not sufficiently attested to warrant their introduction into the texts. And then it must be inferred that the two texts differed at first. They were never identically the same. It is arbitrary to suppose that they were. Why is one passage pronounced the original throughout, and the other a secondary and subsequent form of it which ought to be conformed to the prototype? It is manifest from the variety of reading that the general disposition has been to subordinate the Deuteronomy-text to the Exodus-text, as if the latter were the proper, authentic, God-pronounced form of it. But is not this a mere arbitrary notion? And suppose it were the original, by what right does it occupy the place of the original

in all respects? Must it be all perfect and entire, the *ipsissima verba* uttered by the mouth of Jehovah; and the Deuteronomy-text be invariably wrong *wherever* it deviates from Exodus?

On the whole, it is utterly impossible to correct the one by the other, with the aid of external authorities. We abide by the present readings as the best that can be now obtained. We regard both as originals. We cannot, dare not affirm, that the one consists in all respects of the very words written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and the other not. It is mere conjecture to affirm this of one in preference to the other. That the ten commandments were propounded in definite words must be asserted on the highest authority; but *the definite words themselves* who shall undertake to settle, with the two varying texts before him? They cannot be positively determined. The thing is impossible. The theologian must take both texts, and presuming that they were written at first just as they now are, explain the differences as best he may. Possibly he may not easily find an explanation in *the inference* drawn from Exod. xx. 22, and Deut. v. 22, viz. that the words of the whole Decalogue were *articulately pronounced* by the voice of God. Possibly he may not easily find an explanation in the doctrine of *verbal inspiration.* Possibly he must explain in some other way how it comes to pass that the writer says in both cases *God spake the words;* and yet the words themselves in both cases are not identically the same. A wide field for discussion is opened up here, on which we cannot enter. Such as know De Wette's view of the two narratives, viz. that they are merely "two paraphrases"—a view held by Fulda, Von Bohlen, Vatke, and George, will gladly have recourse to the observations in reply by Bleek and Hävernick. They will willingly endeavour to keep the present question apart from another with which it has been connected, viz. the authorship of the Pentatcuch. The decision of textual criticism is, that both

relations are originals; and there it leaves the question. At this point the higher criticism and systematic theology may take it up and consider it in its widest scope. It is certainly important.

Psalm xxviii. 8.

"The Lord is their strength; and he is the saving strength of his anointed."

Here לָמוֹ "to them" is לְעַמּוֹ "to his people" in eight MSS., two of them a *prima manu*, in the Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, and Arabic. There is also no antecedent. Hence the emendation is adopted by Michaelis, Doederlein, Dathe, Lowth, Horsley, Kennicott, &c. But such evidence is far from shewing that the text needs alteration. In the preceding verses, the Psalmist had prayed for himself, not merely in his individual capacity but in his kingly relation to and union with his people. Hence the transition from the first to the third person was easy and natural. He spoke for the people as well as for himself, and therefore he insensibly substituted the third person plural for the first singular. The proposed reading arose from the apparent difficulty of the present one. And it was evidently taken from Psalm xxix. 11. But as in other cases, so here also, the more difficult reading should be preferred.

Isaiah liii. 8.

Here the words וּמִפֶּשַׁע עַמִּי נֻגַּע לָמוֹ, "for the transgression of my people was he smitten," are thought unsuitable to the context, because the preceding and following connection speaks of one person. Hence לָמוֹ must either be taken in the singular number, or there is a mistake in the text.

The Septuagint has ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον in all its MSS., in all the versions taken from it, and all the citations of the fathers.

Hence the translators read למות; or perhaps conjectured that the Masoretic reading was an abbreviation of למות.

It has also been argued that the Alexandrine reading was in the Hebrew text in the time of Origen, because a learned Jew with whom Origen disputed was embarrassed by the citation of it from the Septuagint, and did not appeal to the Hebrew original. Neither did Origen himself say anything of the Hebrew.* But this may be better explained from the Jew's ignorance of Hebrew. Perhaps Origen himself was very slightly acquainted with it. The Jews at Alexandria spoke Greek, having lost their knowledge of Hebrew long before the time of Origen.†

But all other authorities have the common reading לָמוֹ. All MSS. and versions have it, with the sole exception of the Septuagint. Jerome himself has *eum*.

With these authorities in favour of the textual reading, it is surprising that so many scholars should have adopted the Septuagint emendation, as if internal grounds could elevate the one version to so great a height as to overpower all remaining testimonies. Cappell, Houbigant, Michaelis, Kennicott, Lowth, Koppe, Jahn adopt it. But there is no necessity for such correction. The pronoun is plural, and refers to עַמִּי, *my people*. In that case נגע is a noun, not a verb. The pronoun לָמוֹ might also be taken in the singular, as it is by many, *for him* or *upon him* (compare Isaiah xxx. 5). Whatever interpretation be adopted, we must abide by the received text.‡

Isaiah xix. 18.

In the Masoretic text we find here the words עיר ההרס *city of destruction*. But in various documents it is עיר החרס *city*

* Contra Cels. Lib. i. p. 370, ed. 1733.

† Gesenius, Commentar ueber den Jesaia, vol. iii. p. 184.

‡ See Knobel, Der Prophet Jesaia, p. 377.

of the sun. Hence it has been asserted that the Jews altered the Hebrew copies wilfully. The original reading, it is said, was *city of the sun*, which was changed into the present one *city of destruction* by the Jews of Palestine for the purpose of converting a prediction respecting the temple of Onias in the Heliopolitan nome into a threatening of its destruction. Let us see the evidence in favour of the unmasoretic reading, *city of the sun*, עיר החרס.

It is in 15 MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi, but in several of them a *prima manu* not now, in the margin of one of them. It is also in the Brescia edition of the Bible, in both Münster's Hebrew-Latin editions 1534, 1546, but with another reading in the margin. It is in Symmachus, the Complutensian Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Arabic of Saadias. We find it likewise in the margin of the Venice Bible 1518, and in the appendix to the Basel edition 1536. Abenezra found ח in some MSS. In like manner the MSS. of the Talmudic tract Menachoth, fol. 110, read it.

Internal evidence is also adduced in favour of it. It is affirmed that the present reading *city of destruction* is wholly irrelevant. It does not suit the premises of the context, which allude to the establishment of the worship of the true God. Hence mention of one of the cities as *a city of destruction* is inappropriate.

It is scarcely worth while to refer to another reading, viz. הַחֵרֶם *of anathema* which is supported by cod. 700 of De Rossi and three others *a prima manu*, while another states that other copies so read the passage. Cod. 490 of Kennicott has in the margin בית שמש, *Bethshemesh* as the Chaldee renders it. The Arabic has عير شمس i. e. Heliopolis. Other varieties may be seen in De Rossi.

It is manifest from these various readings that none of them, or indeed all together, are to be compared in weight with

that of the *textus receptus.* The common reading is therefore the right one. We must abide by it, and explain it in the best manner we can. The argument against it derived from the context depends wholly on *the explanation* of the passage. There is no irrelevancy, if the proper sense of the whole be given. The name is a symbolical one, as Knobel rightly observes. It should not be taken as a proper noun. For one town or city which shall perish in its unbelief, five shall profess the true faith. Five sixths shall be converted to the true God.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED BY R. AND R. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

4

17

BS525 .D25 v.1
A treatise on Biblical criticism
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00011 3425